

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 096

PS 007 158

AUTHOR Myers, Leta F., Ed.
TITLE The Family and Community Impact of Day Care:
Preliminary Findings. Center for Human Services
Development Report No. 17.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Coll. of
Human Development.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Public Welfare,
Harrisburg.
REPORT NO PSU-CHSD-R-17
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 217p.; For other reports in this series, see PS 007
154-164

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$10.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Community Involvement; *Day Care Services; Family
Income; *Family Resources; Fathers; Interpersonal
Relationship; Interviews; Marriage; Mothers; *Parent
Participation; *Participant Satisfaction;
Questionnaires; Rural Urban Differences;
Socioeconomic Influences; Working Women

ABSTRACT

This document presents the preliminary analysis and findings of the first three parts of the Family and Community Impact Study designed to investigate the influences of day care on families and communities in Pennsylvania. The three reports discuss: (1) parent participation in day care and the relationship between the use of day care facilities and marital satisfaction; (2) the relationship between day care facilities and the community, described in terms of community participation and the utilization of community services; and (3) the impact of day care on family economics, described in terms of family income, rate of employment of spouses, and use of free time by the unemployed day care mother. Data were obtained from parents who had a child in day care or were waiting to place a child. Data tables and bibliographies are included. (CS)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

CENTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES DEVELOPMENT

THE FAMILY AND COMMUNITY IMPACT OF DAY CARE
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Edited by Leta F. Myers

December 1972

CHSD Report No. 17

**COLLEGE OF
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA. 16802

ED 097096

PS 007158

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© The Pennsylvania State University 1972

Center for Human Services Development

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Pa. State
Univ.*

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was made possible through the cooperation and encouragement of many individuals associated with day care services throughout Pennsylvania and the staff of the Pennsylvania Day Care Study.

We are particularly grateful to the many parents who gave freely of their time to tell us about their day care needs and experiences.

Our field interviewers showed both skill and tenacity in accurately completing their interviews. They were: Herbert Becker, Neal Boyer, Margaret Burris, Geraldine Green, Mary James, Arlene Petite, Vivian Rawson, Jerry Salsgiver, June Stacey, and John Yellets.

Members of the statistical consulting service at The Pennsylvania State University, particularly Robert Heckard and Jeff Kunkle contributed greatly to the analysis and computer programming of data.

We are also grateful to Georgianna Oja for her very thorough editorial assistance and Eileen Hahn, senior secretary of the Pennsylvania Day Care Study, for her invaluable technical assistance.

Appreciation also goes to Jan Harrell and Mary Jane Hostetter for their work early in the project. Special thanks goes to Donald L. Peters, Project Head, and Elizabeth P. Kirchner, Deputy Project Head, for their conceptual aid and continued encouragement of our work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	111
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PARENT PARTICIPATION IN DAY CARE AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE USE OF DAY CARE FACILITIES AND MARITAL SATISFACTION	
<i>Leta F. Myers</i>	3
THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE PARENT PARTICIPATION ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	
<i>Lu V. Keiter</i>	117
ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE USE OF DAY CARE CENTERS UPON THE FAMILY	
<i>Virginia Elliott</i>	181
SUMMARY.....	212
REFERENCES FOR THE INTRODUCTION.....	214

THE FAMILY AND COMMUNITY IMPACT OF DAY CARE

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Edited by Leta F. Myers

The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

The Family and Community Impact Study was designed to provide information which would aid in evaluating day care as relevant to the family and the community (The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, 1972). The study concerns itself with the following four topics:

1. Parent participation in day care and the relationship between the use of day care facilities and marital satisfaction, L. Myers.
2. The relationship between day care facilities and the community, described in terms of community participation and the utilization of community services, L. V. Keiter.
3. The impact of day care on family economics, described in terms of family income, rate of employment of spouses, and use of free time by the unemployed day care mother, V. Elliott.
4. The influence of day care on the parent-child relationship, with particular emphasis on the mother's work motivation and her satisfaction with child care, J. Harrell.

This report presents the preliminary analysis and findings from the first three parts of the study. Part four and more extended analyses of the data will be included in future reports.

The data which is presented in these papers was obtained through The Family and Community Day Care Interview (Myers, Elliott, Harrell, & Hostetter, 1972). The interview was administered to parents across Pennsylvania who had a child in or were waiting to place a child in a day care center.¹

As one interview was utilized to give information on four topics, the sample characteristics in the case of each paper are the same. The first paper "Parent Participation in Day Care and the Relationship Between the Use of Day Care Facilities and Marital Satisfaction" provides a full description of the sample, while the remaining papers provide only sample information relevant to their aspect of the study.

¹A day care center is defined in this study as a place where care, in lieu of parental care, is provided for part of the 24-hour day for seven or more children under 16 years of age who are not relatives of the operator.

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN DAY CARE AND THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE USE OF DAY
CARE FACILITIES AND MARITAL SATISFACTION¹

Leta F. Myers

The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

This report presents the analysis of a questionnaire designed to provide a description of parent participation in day care in Pennsylvania and to evaluate the relationship between a family's utilization of day care facilities and the husband-wife relationship.

The two groups studied were parents with children using day care facilities and parents with children on day care center waiting lists. The 190 families interviewed were sampled from both urban and rural and Social Security Act Title IV-A and privately funded centers.

Results revealed a great variety of participation activities, generally of a social nature, with private urban fathers and Title IV-A rural mothers generally showing the highest participation. The families demonstrating the highest marital satisfaction of both mothers and fathers were those in which the mother was employed and day care services were used. Actual participation at the day care center was not found to correlate with marital satisfaction.

¹This report was prepared under contract with the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. The opinions and recommendations expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the sponsoring agency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
ABSTRACT.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	9
Need for Day Care.....	9
Response to the Day Care Problem.....	11
Rules and Regulations Concerning Day Care.....	13
Purpose of the Study.....	17
Literature Outlining Reasons for Parent Involvement.....	17
Literature Outlining Procedure for Parent Participation.....	22
Success and Failure of Parent Participation.....	27
Effects of Parent Participation.....	29
Effects of Day Care on the Marital Relationship.....	30
METHODOLOGY.....	32
Sample Design.....	32
Sample Selection.....	34
Sample Bias.....	39
Center Bias.....	39
Family Bias.....	40
Sample Characteristics.....	40
Age.....	42
Education.....	42
Marriage.....	43
Family Employment.....	44
Type of Employment.....	45
Socioeconomic Status.....	46
Family Income.....	48
Families on Welfare.....	49
Day Care Children in Sample.....	50
Ages of Day Care Children.....	51
Months in Day Care.....	52
Hours Per Week in Day Care.....	52
RESULTS.....	54
Parent Participation in Day Care.....	54
Activities Cited by Parents.....	54
Number of Activities Cited.....	54
Participation by Group.....	55
Type of Activities Cited.....	57
Level of Activity by Group.....	58
Activities Acknowledged by Parents.....	60
Social Activities.....	60
Continuing Group Membership.....	62
Volunteer Activities.....	64
Professional-Semiprofessional Activities.....	67
Activities Prior to the Opening of the Day Care Centers.....	69
Advisory Board Membership.....	71
Parent Education.....	73

Topic	Page
Toys and Books for Home Use.....	74
Observation of Children.....	75
Parents Contacted by Center.....	78
Services Offered at Center.....	82
Referred Services.....	84
Complaints Concerning the Day Care Center.....	85
Likes and Dislikes Concerning Participation in Day Care.....	87
Desired Participation.....	88
Hindrances to Participation.....	90
Overall Index of Parent Participation.....	92
Possible Determinants of Parent Participation.....	95
Marital Satisfaction.....	96
DISCUSSION.....	99
Between Center Differences in Participation.....	100
Mother vs. Father Differences in Participation.....	101
Degree of Parents' Participation.....	101
Parents' Idea of Participation.....	102
What Parents Do and Want.....	103
Day Care and the Marital Relationship.....	104
Further Study of Present Data.....	105
SUMMARY.....	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	112

TABLES

Table 1	Distribution of Sample According to Enrollment and Geographical Area.....	34
Table 2	Per Capita Income for the Primary Counties.....	36
Table 3	Distribution of Centers According to Geographical Area and Type.....	38
Table 4	Actual and Ideal Distribution of Sample.....	40
Table 5	Mean Years of Education Completed.....	43
Table 6	Mean Number of Years of Marriage.....	43
Table 7	Family Employment of All Families Interviewed.....	44
Table 8	Two-Spouse Employment.....	44
Table 9	Rate of Employment.....	45
Table 10	Type of Employment.....	46

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 11 Socioeconomic Status.....	47
Table 12 Mean SES Scores.....	47
Table 13 Size of Different Income Ranges.....	48
Table 14 Mean Annual Income in Dollars.....	49
Table 15 Families Receiving Welfare Funds.....	49
Table 16 Day Care Families Using Welfare Funds.....	50
Table 17 Number of Children Per Family in Day Care.....	51
Table 18 Number of Day Care Children by Age.....	52
Table 19 Months in Day Care.....	53
Table 20 Number of Hours in Day Care Per Week.....	53
Table 21 Number of Activities Cited.....	55
Table 22 Amount of Cited Participation: Group Means.....	56
Table 23 Level of Activity.....	57
Table 24 Level of Cited Participation: Group Means.....	58
Table 25 Social Activities.....	61
Table 26 Social Activities Index: Group Means.....	61
Table 27 Continuing Group Membership.....	63
Table 28 Mean Group Membership Scores.....	63
Table 29 Volunteer Activities.....	65
Table 30 Volunteer Activities: Group Means.....	66
Table 31 Professional or Semiprofessional Activities of the Mothers.....	67
Table 32 Professional or Semiprofessional Activity Scores of the Mothers: Group Means.....	68
Table 33 Participation Prior to the Opening of the Center.....	69
Table 34 Center Initiation Scores.....	70
Table 35 Total Present or Past Membership on Advisory Boards.....	71

Topic	Page
Table 36 Parent Education Courses.....	73
Table 37 Toys and Books Provided for Use at Home.....	74
Table 38 Observation of Children at Center.....	76
Table 39 Parents Contacted by Center.....	79
Table 40 Communications Between Parents and Center.....	80
Table 41 Mean Communication Scores.....	81
Table 42 Frequency of Communications with Center.....	83
Table 43 Services Utilized at Day Care Center by Mothers.....	84
Table 44 Community Services Referred to by Day Care Center.....	85
Table 45 Complaints Concerning Center.....	86
Table 46 Level of Satisfaction.....	87
Table 47 Desired Participation of Mothers: First Choice.....	88
Table 48 Desired Participation of Mothers: Second Choice.....	89
Table 49 Desired Participation of Mothers: Third Choice.....	89
Table 50 Desired Participation of Fathers.....	90
Table 51 Hindrances to Participation.....	91
Table 52 Overall Index of Parent Participation.....	94
Table 53 Mean Participation Scores.....	94
Table 54 Marital Satisfaction Index of Mothers: Group Means.....	96
Table 55 Marital Satisfaction Index of Fathers: Group Means.....	97
Table 56 Mothers' Assessment of Marital Satisfaction.....	98
Table 57 Fathers' Assessment of Marital Satisfaction.....	99

FIGURE

Figure 1 The Four Rural Areas Selected for Inclusion in This Study.....	37
---	----

PARENT PARTICIPATION IN DAY CARE AND THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE USE OF DAY
CARE FACILITIES AND MARITAL SATISFACTION

Leta F. Myers

The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

Need for Day Care

Many possible reasons have been given for the well-documented, increasing need for child care services in the United States, specifically day care services. Kagan & Whitten (1970) cited the change in middle-class attitudes, which has led to the increase in the number of middle-class mothers who wish to be released from some of their child rearing responsibilities so that they might pursue other interests, and the number of poor mothers who seek work away from home to relieve their financial burdens as two of these reasons. They further stated that in some cultures other family and nonfamily members share in the raising of children but that the American mother seems to be much more isolated in her role. If she wishes to be away from home, there is often no family member to care for the children; she is forced to seek other solutions to her problem.

The Children's Bureau in 1965 conducted a survey of the number of working mothers in the United States and the type of care their children were receiving (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and U. S. Department of Labor, 1968, p. 26). At the time of the survey there were 6.3 million mothers who worked full-time and had children

under 14 years of age. Nine out of ten mothers stated that they worked because of economic need. There were several arrangements for child care. Nearly half of the children were cared for in their homes by a relative or nonrelative; 16% were cared for in other peoples homes; some went to work with their mothers in such places as family stores. The rarest arrangement of all, involving only 2% of the children, was a day care center or nursery school. A surprising 8% of the children cared for themselves. Four percent of those children who looked after themselves were actually under 6 years of age.

In the survey mothers were asked about their level of satisfaction concerning the arrangement they had made for their children's care. The 8% who were somewhat, or very, unsatisfied cited reasons such as high cost or poor treatment of their children. The surveyors found that in many of the cases where mothers claimed to be satisfied, they were simply tolerating a situation for which they saw no alternative. The researchers suggested that "the problem millions of mothers and their families face, around child care, merits a more careful examination...[HEW and U. S. Department of Labor, 1968, p. 26]."

Other studies have emphasized the seriousness of the problem. In a study of 2,500 families conducted by the Child Welfare League Day Care Project about one-half of the working mothers expressed some dissatisfaction with their day care arrangements (Ruderman, 1965). A Department of Labor and Wage Labor Standards Administration study in 1968 did not paint a promising picture for the future (p. 7). It found that the number of working mothers had increased sevenfold since 1940 and doubled since 1950. It further estimated that the number of working mothers with preschool

children in 1967 (3.9 million) would increase to 4.5 million by 1970 and to 5.3 million by 1975. This projection was based on a projection of the number of currently working mothers. The 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act (Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, 1967) may have made the actual figure even larger. They require that many of the mothers who receive aid to families with dependent children be trained for jobs. They also require day care services. Mothers cannot refuse to participate in these training programs - WIN programs - without either just cause or a cut in their welfare payments (New York University Law Review, 1969, p. 798). The 1967 legislation stresses the fact that the state welfare agencies must supply adequate day care, or a mother will have just cause for refusing the program. If the program is to succeed, and mothers are to be trained, employed, and removed from the welfare roles, then adequate day care must be provided.

A consideration of (a) the day care needs of presently working mothers, those who claim dissatisfaction, and those who see no alternative to the present care of their children but might possibly welcome one, (b) the enormous increase in the number of working mothers of preschoolers expected by 1980 (a 43% increase over 1970), (c) the responsibility of state governments to supply adequate day care to WIN mothers, and (d) the projected need of WIN mothers for continued day care service makes the prospects for satisfying the demands for adequate day care seem dim; that is, unless steps are taken quickly to increase both the availability of and quality of day care services in the United States.

Response to the Day Care Problem

Several federal agencies have responded to the pressing need for day

care by making funds available for projects which they define as: "projects which provide care, guidance, and supervision for children away from their homes during the day [U. S. Department of Labor-Wage and Labor Standards Administration, 1969, pp. 1-5]." One very significant source of funding comes from Title IV, parts 7A and B, of the 1967 amendments of the Social Security Act (Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, 1967, p. 73). Section 402 (a) (14) and (15) B1 of Title IV Part A states that "child care services, including day care, be furnished to every parent, relative or other appropriate individual who is referred to and enrolled by the Department of Labor in the Work Incentive Program [p. 73]." It also states, "State and local welfare departments are authorized to provide day care services to other families who are receiving AFDC payments [p. 73]." In addition, provision of day care services may be extended at the option of the state to former and potential applicants and recipients of AFDC (Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, 1967, p. 73). State and local welfare departments are permitted to supply services in a variety of ways: through directly purchased services from other public agencies, private nonprofit organizations, or individuals.

Section 421 and 422 of Title IV Part B of the Social Security Act as amended in 1967 makes further provisions for grants-in-aid to state public welfare agencies for child welfare services including day care (Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, 1967). Priority for provision of day care must be given to low-income groups, migrant workers, and other groups showing the greatest relative need. In both cases the major part of the funding is supplied by the federal government.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has taken advantage of the new federal provisions to help in supplying more adequate and extensive day care services for its residents, particularly for children of working mothers and children of mothers who are in job training situations. Under the new provisions the State Welfare Department of Pennsylvania has been able to channel federal funds into several hundred day care centers.

Rules and Regulations Concerning Day Care

Along with the funds that the federal government has made available to the state for the development of day care projects come program requirements, rules, and regulations for centers, which both the state and individual centers must observe in order to gain and retain their funding. These regulations are entitled Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (1967). The requirements may be waived only when the administering agency shows that "waiver may advance innovation and experimentation and extend services without loss of quality in the facility [p. 77]." Permission for a waiver must be received from the regional office of the federal agency which is providing the funds.

The regulations with which this proposal is concerned are those entitled Title 45 Subtitle A Sec. 71.18 Parent Involvement. They are the following:

(a) Opportunities must be provided parents at a time convenient to them to work with the program and, whenever possible, to observe their children in the day care facility.

(b) Parents must have the opportunity to become involved themselves in the making of decisions concerning the nature and operation of the day care facility.

(c) Whenever an agency (i.e., an operating or an administering agency) provides day care for 40 or more children, there must be a policy advisory committee or its equivalent at that administrative level where most decisions are made; i.e., that level where decisions are made on the kinds of programs to be operated, the hiring of staff, the budgeting of funds, and the submission of applications to funding agencies. The committee membership should include not less than 50 percent parents or parent representatives, selected by the parents themselves in a democratic fashion. Other members should include representatives of professional organizations or individuals who have particular knowledge or skills in children's and family programs.

(d) Policy advisory committees (the structure of which will vary depending upon the administering agencies and facilities involved) must perform productive functions, including but not limited to:

(1) Assisting in the development of the programs and approving applications for funding.

(2) Participating in the nomination and selection of the program director at the operating and/or administering level.

(3) Advising on the recruitment and selection of staff and volunteers.

(4) Initiating suggestions and ideas for program improvements.

(5) Serving as a channel for hearing complaints on the program.

(6) Assisting in organizing activities for parents.

(7) Assuming a degree of responsibility for communicating with parents and encouraging their participation in the program [p. 77].

The State of Pennsylvania's Office of Family Services, operating under the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, in June 1969 published a manual entitled Title 4600 Regulation-Child Day Care Centers Under Social Service Auspices. The section of the manual entitled

"4604 General Requirements," listed below, is quite similar to the federal regulations in the interagency requirements. The rules are applicable to all day care centers receiving public funds. Day care centers are defined as "any premises in which child day care is provided simultaneously for seven or more children who are not relatives of the operator [p. 1]." The "4604 General Requirements" are the following:

Rev. *A. Child day care centers shall conform to all local public and safety codes, applicable laws and regulations set forth by the Pennsylvania Departments of Health, Labor and Industry, State and Public Welfare, and to the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission as well as to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

**

B. Any social service auspice offering day care services shall be administered in accordance with the regulations set forth in Title 3100 - Voluntary Child Welfare Agencies as the case may be.

C. Day Care centers operated by non-profit organizations engaged in multifunction services other than child welfare shall have a standing Day Care Committee appointed by the governing body of not less than five members representative of the community served and the sponsoring organization. One member of such committee shall be the designated representative of the governing body. The Director of the Day Care Center shall attend all meetings of the committee which shall meet at least eight times annually. The committee shall advise the governing body on matters requiring its action in compliance with the duties of the governing bodies as set forth in Title 3100 - Voluntary Child Welfare Agencies.

Rev. *D. (In lieu of item C above) Whenever an agency provides day care for forty or more children, there shall be a policy advisory committee or its equivalent at that administrative level where most decisions are made. The committee membership should include not less than fifty percent parents or parent representatives, selected by the parents themselves in a democratic fashion. Other members should include representatives of professional organizations

- or individuals who have particular knowledge
- ** or skills in children's and family programs.

Rev. *E. Policy advisory committee shall perform the following functions:

1. assist in the development of the programs and approve applications for funding.
 2. participate in the nomination and selection of the program director at the operating and/or administering level.
 3. advise on the recruitment and selection of staff and volunteers.
 4. initiate suggestions and ideas for program improvements.
 5. serve as a channel for hearing complaints on the program.
 6. assist in organizing activities for parents.
 7. assume a degree of responsibility for communicating with parents and encourage
- ** their participation in the program.

F. A social welfare service shall be an integral part of day care services provided under social service auspices. The social welfare service may be provided directly by the staff of the auspice agency or by purchase from a family or children's agency or institution approved by the Department as meeting its regulations.

Rev. *G. The auspice agency shall give priority in the provision of day care service to low-income or other groups in the population and geographic area which meet the eligibility requirements and have the greatest relative need.

H. In establishing or utilizing a day care facility, all the following factors shall be considered:

1. travel time for both the children and their parents.
2. convenience to the home or work site of parents to enable them to participate in the program.

3. accessibility of other resources which enhance the day care program.
4. opportunities for involvement of the parents and the neighborhood [pp. 2-3].

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, there is the concern with the reality of parent participation in day care in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Both state and federal regulations call for parent participation at Title IV-A funded centers,² although many of the regulations are easily interpreted in a rather broad manner and parent participation can be defined in a number of ways. An attempt has been made to provide a general description of parent participation in day care centers across Pennsylvania (in both Title IV-A and privately funded centers). Second is the problem of the relationship between a family's utilization of day care facilities and the husband-wife relationship or, more specifically, their marital satisfaction.

Before looking at parent participation specific to day care in Pennsylvania it will be helpful to review past literature concerning parent participation, its rationale, procedures, and discernable effects on the family in order to understand why these issues are important.

Literature Outlining Reasons for Parent Involvement

There have been several rationales offered, both by the federal government and by private sources, for parent participation or involvement in day care. A task force on parent participation in a report to

²For the purpose of this study the term Title IV-A funded designates those day care centers that receive at least 50% of their financial support from federal funds established by the 1967 amendments to the United States Social Security Act. The term privately funded designates those day care centers that do not receive their financial support from United States government sources.

the secretary of HEW in 1968 stressed heavily the need for parent participation in HEW Programs (HEW, 1968a, p. 1). It defined participation quite similarly to the federal interagency day care requirements by stating that parent participation concerned (a) membership of parents on advisory committees, (b) opportunities for parents to serve as volunteers and employees, and (c) a family-centered focus and a maximum coordination of services in HEW Programs designed to serve children and youth. It further found that special emphasis should be placed on involving poor and minority group parents. As a basic rationale it cited the extreme stress under which many families exist in our society and the seriously inadequate services available to them. It found that the services which are available (such as day care) often detach the child from the family and act as parent substitutes rather than parent supplements, making the parents feel incompetent and lowering their sense of self esteem. These services also do not encourage the working of the family as a unit but concentrate only on the child; therefore, the fact that a better functioning family emotionally, intellectually, socially, and economically will aid in the development of the child is not recognized. Extensive planning for children's programs by parents was stressed. Not only did it feel that parents are desirous of participation and able to contribute but also that such involvement would strengthen the family as a unit and help it to cope better with the stresses of modern life (HEW, 1968a, pp. 1-8).

Much of the government literature produced pertaining to Project Head Start has also stressed parent participation. Project Head Start: Points for Parents (U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), 1967, p. 2) cited several reasons for and benefits of parent participation.

It stressed that participating parents will gain the following:

- a. Recognition of the qualities they already possess.
- b. Understanding and appreciation of how children grow and learn, and of how learning can be extended into the home.
- c. Confidence in and enjoyment of the role of parents leading to rising hopes for their children.
- d. Greater belief in themselves and their worth as individuals, leading to ever-widening participation in community action.
- e. Experiences in working with other racial, ethnic, and social groups.
- f. New and improved skills opening avenues to job opportunities.
- g. Increased knowledge of community resources and facilities and how they can be used to improve family living.
- h. A chance to discuss family, community, and personal problems and possibly a chance to solve them.
- i. Family togetherness through being involved in projects and activities.
- j. Understanding of the value of parent-school relationships.

One report concerning Head Start (OEO, 1966a, p. 8) emphasized that the professionals who care for children receive benefits from parent participation. It stated that professionals can gain considerable insight and understanding from association with parents. Parents often have valuable ideas and opinions about working with children and can frequently aid the professional in understanding the individual child.

Another Head Start publication (U. S. Office of Child Development,

1967, pp. 10-12) not only reported that parent participation results in the improved self-confidence of parents but also, in discussing the establishment of advisory boards composed of at least 50% parents, claimed that it is the basic right of the parent to make and influence decisions related to the care and future of his or her child and denied the right of any public agency to usurp that power. And still another Head Start report (OEO, 1966b, pp. 5, 1-5, 12) found parent participation in program planning and development central to the development of the child, the family, and the community.

Actual practitioners in the field of day care have also emphasized parent involvement. One professional felt that the parent should be encouraged to understand his child's day care experience (Larrabee, 1969) so that he might build on it, help his child with problems, and enjoy his child's progress. He also emphasized the need of staff members of day care centers to know how individual parents are raising their children so that the staff may understand the children. However, the rationale for parent participation of those actually supplying day care seems to remain quite child-centered. This view is in opposition with the more theoretical rationale offered by federal publications concerned with the entire family, and often entire communities.

Other theorists concerned with citizen participation have offered rationales which might be applied to parent participation in day care centers. Ritchie P. Lowry in an article entitled "Power to the People-- Political Evolution or Revolution?" (1970) found that urban officials were not really responsive or accountable to urban dwellers. He said that the same was true for welfare bureaucrats and welfare recipients and that

"leadership must take a primary role in devising forms of participatory governance which will provide for availability and accountability in the exercise of power [p. 2]." He found the lack of accountability in our system to be contributory to both the apathy and alienation of citizens and sometimes to violent participation without concern for political consequences. The type of citizen influence Lowry considered to be necessary over public institutions certainly would include the influence of parents on day care centers.

Frank Riesman (1966) continued the discussion of the basic right of representation. He found that consumers of social services, particularly the poor, were not given a voice in the manner in which, or nature of what, they consume. He cited this fact as one reason for people not utilizing many services fully, e.g., school dropouts, people not showing up for appointments with welfare workers, etc. He found that many of our social services were really assisting recipients and their families to remain within the cycle of poverty, not allowing them to help themselves and determine their own future. This view is in agreement with opinions discussed earlier which found it neither right nor proper for agencies to become parent substitutes. Both arguments assert that people who are consumers of social services must retain control of their own present and future. This control must certainly include their own children's environment.

Citizen participation is also emphasized in federal programs. The model cities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is a very significant one. Programs are planned with the assumption that every citizen has something to contribute to his community and that

only with such contributions can programs to prevent slums and blight be successful. This rationale has also been extended to parent participation in day care. Parents who are involved in their children's day care will encourage their children more to participate in the day care, to attend regularly, and to gain as much as they can from it. This encouragement is yet another very tangible reason for parent participation in day care. Day care facilities might have better attendance and more stable programs when the parents are involved in the program.

Perhaps Jean and Edgar Cahn have most adequately summed up the entire group of rationales. Citizen participation is "the necessary concomitant to our faith in the dignity and worth and also a denial of his own potential development and contribution to his community (Cahn & Cahn, 1968, p. 225]."

Literature Outlining Procedure for Parent Participation

After reviewing the rather extensive literature advocating and justifying parent participation in general and more specifically in day care, one question becomes outstanding - "How does one achieve the participation advocated?"

Both the federal government, in various publications, and private individuals have suggested several methods of encouraging and sustaining parent participation. In a publication entitled Parents as Partners in Department Programs for Children and Youth - A Report to the Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare by a Task Force on Parent Participation (1968a) numerous methods for developing parent participation have been discussed. The task force, despite its numerous recommendations, found

"almost no research available as to the best ways in which programs can actually be implemented to promote more effective participation by poor people (many of those who will receive day care services under new programs) as advisors, policy-makers and employees in human service fields [p. 5]."

It proceeded nevertheless with what it considered to be a creative response to a critical problem in our society, while at the same time encouraging research to confirm or deny its hypotheses. Its first set of recommendations concerned encouraging the growth of community advisory committees, which would have some direct effect on the functioning of the day care center (one of the federal interagency day care requirements). To make these committees more viable it recommended:

a. Either a staff person, as consultant not chairman to the group, act as a liaison between the committee and administration or funds be made available to committees to hire their own leadership training personnel.

b. The committee have the power to receive full and fair hearings from administrators.

c. One function of the committee be to hear and rectify grievances of those served by the program.

d. Funds be made available to committees for public relations and publicity.

e. Publications by agencies directed towards parents not contain middle-class assumptions such as all mothers are married and all children have fathers in the home.

f. Committee members have their expenses paid.

In dealing with the direct participation of parents the task force suggested that parents be hired as much as possible in programs. It also suggested that formal educational standards be lowered whenever they did not really seem necessary and when parents had other skills such as a good capacity to relate to children. It advised that in such cases jobs should be constructed so that progress could be made and the employee need not be held at one job level. Besides training employees who are nonprofessionals it recommended that professionals be given an opportunity to air their suspicions and resentment of nonprofessionals and that professionals receive higher level tasks as nonprofessionals assume some of their duties.

Volunteers were also encouraged to participate. Activities should be developed to suit their interests and abilities, and in-service training and supervision should be available.

The task force finally suggested that programs must adapt to parents' needs, for example, by offering transportation to those who wish to participate but cannot secure the needed transportation, by having staff members who speak Spanish or other languages common in the community, etc.

The Child Study Association of America in a paper entitled A Curriculum of Training for Parent Participation in Project Head Start (1967) has made further recommendations for parent participation (pp. 4-97). Because it found that insufficient effort is usually made to involve males, it suggested that special efforts to recruit males be made with events such as father's night and tasks such as building or repairing furniture for the center. It further suggested that male recruiters for

males might be more successful. Other suggestions of the association for encouraging parent involvement include:

- a. Begin task groups as social groups.
- b. Supply care for young children while parents participate.
- c. Provide convenient days, hours, and places for people to meet.
- d. Provide educational opportunities in subjects which interest parents, such as nutrition, language, health, citizen action.

The paper also advised that staff members be aware of certain attitudes held toward parents, for instance, a narrow concept of parent participation not going beyond parent education and adult activities and not including decision-making about programs and a lack of confidence in parents' judgment. Parents can sense these feelings on the part of professionals and may accordingly decline to participate.

Other Head Start publications have suggested a great variety of activities to encourage participation. In the following list are only a few from one report (OEO, 1969a):

- a. Invite parents to informal functions such as luncheons to get to know staff members.
- b. Ask parents what they want for themselves (have career development workshops).
- c. Promote parent observation and participation with children at the center.
- d. Visit parents in the home for recruitment and show acceptance.
- e. Ask for parents' ideas; ask them to solve practical problems.
- f. Encourage parents to set agendas for meetings.

As much as parent decision-making has been urged, one Head Start publication (OEO, 1966a) has cautioned that staff, in order to function effectively, must have considerable freedom and flexibility to carry out a program which seems professionally sound. Parents and professionals must trust each other's good intentions and competencies. The publication did not suggest the extent of trust necessary or how free the hand of the professional should be. Yet another Head Start publication (OEO, 1967) has suggested numerous volunteer roles that parents could play to make their relationship meaningful with the center. They include: babysitter, interpreter, gardener, storyteller, recruiter of other parents, shopper for center supplies, and meal helper.

There are also numerous paid staff activities which could be made available to parents, for example, teacher aide, bus driver, maintenance worker, community aide, and clerical helper.

Marbery Larrabee (1969), a social worker, has looked at parent involvement from the responsibility of the social worker's viewpoint. She felt that staff members must be aware of and deal with deterrents to involvement such as (a) lack of felt need to be involved, (b) fear of involvement, (c) overwhelming sense of inadequacy or hopelessness, and (d) reluctance to take on any more responsibility. She did not suggest how staff members can overcome such deterrents.

Gordon (1969) has suggested that parent participation may be described on a 5-point scale, beginning with the most passive and proceeding to the most active, or from the least to the most involved with the day care child's actual activities and the decision-making concerning him. This scale, which follows, does contain most of the components

of participation reviewed earlier.

1. Parents as supporters - service givers - facilitations - clerical, custodial, maintenance, fund raising, family nights.
2. Parents as learners - parent education course, observation of children with explanation.
3. Parents as teachers of their own children - taking home toys and books for use with children.
4. Parents as teacher aides and volunteers in the classroom - prepare materials, read stories, work with children.
5. Parents as policy makers and partners - policy makers, advisory board members [p. 276].

Success and Failure of Parent Participation

Two very natural questions to ask at this point would be: What has been the nature of parent participation thus far? What have been the successes and failures?

One prime area of interest would be research done on Head Start programs because Head Start was planned to include heavy parent involvement and, as discussed before, much of the Head Start literature stresses creating innovative ways of involving parents.

The results of studies vary tremendously. In June, 1969, OEO reported in their Review of Research 1965-1969 diverse results (1969b, pp. 31-35). In one study, professionals, parents, and community leaders worked with each other over a long period of time. They resolved many problems and developed a good center. In a similar study this resolution was not possible and paraprofessionals such as parents did not perform the tasks they were engaged to perform and were in conflict with the professionals. This report gave little information on how actual participation was developed, but did say that, in cases where parents participated in center activities, their children achieved more (Lehr, 1968).

George O. Egland (1966) in a study of 16 Head Start centers found little parent participation. Parents had very little to do with the program's direct work with the children. In cases where parents were hired they were usually dishwashers or cooks but were not involved in educational or cultural activities. Only one parent was a teacher's aide. Rather than working with parents, the professionals worked for parents by providing such programs as household management, counseling, etc. There was a general lack of trained personnel for work with parents, contrary to the recommendation in the Head Start literature. When parents were invited to centers, the response was poor. He found the following reasons for the failure of this aspect of the program.

- a. Parents were not invited or encouraged to visit.
- b. Parents did not feel professionals welcomed them in the work.
- c. Parents lacked time or transportation.
- d. Professionals may not have wished to be observed in their work or have the responsibility of training and counseling parents.

In 1966 (Peters & Stein) a study of Head Start centers in San Mateo County, California, again reported mixed findings. Parents were interviewed in order to assess how they felt about parent involvement programs.

The following are some of the results:

- a. Ninety-two percent of the parents felt they should come and help in programs for their children.
- b. Seventy-five percent said they would be willing if asked.
- c. Thirteen percent indicated they had been asked to help.
- d. Eighty percent said they had been asked to come to the program with their child.

e. Thirty-three percent had done so.

f. Forty-six percent had been asked to take part in the parents advisory committee.

g. Thirty-one percent attended a parents' meeting although 44% said the time was convenient.

The study found a considerable amount of latent interest towards becoming involved but little translation into action. It found that problems as elementary as lack of babysitters and transportation may hinder involvement.

An interview of Head Start teachers in the San Mateo study leads to another perspective on parent involvement. The teachers often recommended that additional home visits be made by the staff and that an attempt be made to get the parents involved earlier in the program.

Prelude to School (HEW, 1968b), an evaluation of an inner-city preschool program, reported some of the same results as were found for Head Start (pp. 43-44). The program was more didactic and less a meeting of partners than it was in theory. Parents looked upon staff as experts. Staff members worked from this position. Even though this approach was not the one decided upon at the start, they came to find it highly desirable and necessary.

Effects of Parent Participation

It becomes apparent after reviewing numerous studies that uniform results have not been achieved in parent participation efforts, and, moreover, in many cases researchers are not yet clear as to all of the reasons for their successes and failures. One may ask however if parent participation had the predicted effects on the parent and child.

The results are again conflicting. Schaefer (1971) found that almost any type of parent involvement in the school raised children's achievement and attendance. The effects on parents themselves are not as clear. Chilman (1966) found that parents that had some measure of control over their schools had an enhanced cultural identity and self concept, which in turn raised achievement. Cloward and Jones (1969) reported that involved parents have a greater feeling of fate control than those not involved. Others (Kirschner Associates, Inc., 1970, p. 73) have stressed the fact that effective parent involvement in Head Start activities leads to change in other community institutions.

Effects of Day Care on the Marital Relationship

It seems that little research thus far has been directed toward how the family and, more specifically, the marital relationship is affected by day care. The literature reviewed reiterates several times the possibility of strengthening the family as a unit and enabling the family to discuss its problems, and possibly solve them, and experience greater togetherness. Any literature on the direct effects on the marital relationship is sparse.

At this point some informal information has been received which leads one to suspect both cultural and class differences. One researcher (Hoffman, 1971) cites, on the basis of group interviews with day care parents, the unhappiness of Mexican-American fathers with the day care situation and a marked preference that their wives remain at home. Gwen Morgan (1968) also believes that there is quite a prevalent twofold prejudice against day care: (a) children should be reared at home by their mothers and (b) wives should not work but stay at home. It appears that

a violation of these beliefs could cause marital problems. However, Hoffman (1971) has also found that women often claim that their marriages are happier with day care.

It appears that both Morgan and Hoffman have assumed that day care mothers are working mothers. The question becomes quite complicated as they are not merely suggesting the effect of day care on the marriage but also the effect of maternal employment on the marriage. The literature pertaining to maternal employment generally finds marital satisfaction to be lower in maternally employed families with the net adverse effect to be less in higher socioeconomic status families than in lower ones (Nye, 1961). If one could consider day care families, particularly the maternally employed ones, to be in an analogous situation, one could predict that their marital satisfaction might be lowered by their use of day care and by maternal employment (Nye, 1961).

However, Fried (1971a and 1971b) found financial status to be the best sole predictor of marital satisfaction. With an increased financial level there is generally increased marital satisfaction. In the cases where day care occurs with maternal employment, and therefore a probable higher financial level in the family is achieved, marital satisfaction might very well increase. There are, therefore, competing influences: the possible negative influence of the child being out of the home or the mother being a wage earner and the positive influence of increased family income.

The additional effects of parent participation at the day care center on the marital relationship has not been addressed in the literature to any extent, although it has been suggested that in families in which both spouses are high participants at the day care center there are greater feelings of joint sociability and satisfaction in the marriage.

METHODOLOGY

Information related to the topics of parent participation and the effect of day care on the marital relationship was obtained through an interview schedule which was administered to a sample of day care families and families awaiting enrollment in day care throughout Pennsylvania. The interview was developed on the basis of existing literature, observations and interviews at day care centers, and by adapting some existing interviews and questionnaires. For a fuller explanation of the origin and a rationale of the specific questions consult The Family and Community Day Care Interview, The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, Technical Report No. 6, 1972.

Sample Design

Two groups of parents were designated to be interviewed. One group was to include families with one child or more in day care and the other was to include families willing to place one child or more in day care but which had not yet been able to enroll the child or children. Using non-day care families in the study made it possible to formulate stronger inferences about the effect of day care on families presently enrolled.

If the national statistics for 1-parent and 2-parent families and the increased number of 1-parent families in the lower socioeconomic groups are considered, it seems reasonable to assume that many of the families using day care are 1-parent families, especially since those families in the lower economic groups and particularly those on welfare are given preference at funded day care facilities (Grotberg, 1971). Consequently, it would have been desirable to include in the study

families with couples with an ongoing stable relationship but not legally married. However, because some additional factors compounded the problem, a family was designated as a household when there were both a legally married couple and one or more children.

This study was funded by the Department of Welfare for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That authority enabled us, in many cases, to gain the cooperation of the interviewee. We believed that many interviewees, particularly those who were on welfare, would be quite hesitant to reveal the presence of an adult male who might possibly be contributing financially to the household. We reasoned that persons in such a situation might feel that this information would do them harm in the hands of welfare agents. While welfare officials are not permitted to discriminate against family units which have an unrelated adult male as a component, they are allowed to question whether the male is contributing to the family's income and to adjust welfare payments accordingly. It is doubtful that, as representatives of the Department of Welfare's authority, we could establish enough trust to insure much openness of the interviewee on this topic. Consequently, only families in the legal sense were designated for study, with both the husband and wife designated for interview.

It was desirable that the sample be representative of urban and rural day care as well as Title IV-A funded and privately funded day care centers. The distinction between Title IV-A and private was needed because of the possible differences between the two types of centers and the resulting differences of effect on the family. Title IV-A centers have more stringent regulations concerning parent participation and, therefore,

may deal with parents on a different basis than private centers do.

Title IV-A centers must give preference to families whose need for day care is greatest and charge fees on a sliding scale with nominal amounts or free services applying to families under certain income levels.

Title IV-A and private centers may differ therefore not only in program but in types of families using their services, particularly families of different income levels. The sample was divided between urban and rural centers to obtain a better state-wide picture in anticipation of the fact that both urban and rural centers may differ both in program and family composition. Such factors as possible cultural differences between our urban and rural areas, differences in availability of employment, and differences in ethnic composition may appear for these two segments of the population. Table 1 represents the distribution of the sample by type of center or unenrolled and by rural or urban. The total sample size desired was 240 families with 40 families in each cell.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO
ENROLLMENT AND GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

Type of Enrollment	Urban	Rural
Waiting list	40	40
Title IV-A day care	40	40
Private day care	40	40

Sample Selection

Although we wanted families from a great variety of urban areas, such a sample was economically unfeasible. Such an effort would have

necessitated sending interviewers to homes across the Commonwealth, with perhaps one or two interviews in each city or rural area. The cost for such travel would have been prohibitive. As an alternative we decided to designate Philadelphia and Pittsburgh as the urban areas. The use of interviews from both their core city areas and suburban areas combined should provide an adequate picture of urban day care in Pennsylvania.

Based on selected criteria, four rural areas were chosen that best represented rural Pennsylvania. All of the rural counties in Pennsylvania were first identified. Counties were then selected so that there would be some geographical distribution across the state and some distribution as far as population density and per capita income. After each area was selected the roster of all day care facilities in the state was checked to determine the number of Title IV-A and private centers in that county. Several counties were discarded because they contained none or only one or two centers, and in such cases the next best county was then selected. We found however that an insufficient number of rural centers were identified. In the case of each rural county a geographically adjacent county was therefore selected in order to acquire a sufficient number of centers. Although it was difficult to select the adjacent counties using the original criteria of income and population, geographic distribution was maintained. The four two-county areas selected were:

<u>Primary County</u>	<u>Adjacent County</u>
Tioga	Bradford
Schuylkill	Northumberland
Erie	Warren
Bedford	Blair

Their location is indicated on Figure 1. Centers were selected first from the primary counties, and when necessary additional ones were selected from the adjacent counties.

Per capita incomes for the four primary counties covered the range indicated in Table 2. The income averages found in Table 2 span the range of per capita rural incomes by county for Pennsylvania, except for the fact that the very lowest end of the scale, i.e., \$2,000 is not represented. The few counties with such low per capita incomes at the time the sample was drawn had no day care centers.

TABLE 2
PER CAPITA INCOME FOR THE PRIMARY COUNTIES

Erie	\$3,550
Schuylkill	\$2,856
Tioga	\$2,437
Bedford	\$2,299

The population density for the four counties was the following:

Erie	309/sq. mile
Schuylkill	221/sq. mile
Tioga	32/sq. mile
Bedford	42/sq. mile

This range is reasonably representative of the rural counties enumerated by the U. S. Census Bureau. Two counties were quite sparsely populated, and two were more moderately populated. All of these counties can be considered much more rural than Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, which have the



Figure 1. The four rural areas selected for inclusion in this study.

following population densities:

Philadelphia	15,584/sq. mile
Pittsburgh	10,968/sq. mile

After the six sampling areas were determined, lists for each area were compiled of all the Title IV-A and private day care centers in the area. From each list of the four rural areas two private and two Title IV-A centers were randomly selected. For each urban area four private and four Title IV-A centers were selected. Therefore, a total of 32 centers were included in the study (see Table 3).

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF CENTERS ACCORDING
TO GEOGRAPHICAL AREA AND TYPE

Title	Urban	Rural
Title IV-A day care center	8	8
Private day care center	8	8

All 32 centers were contacted in order to obtain a list of all of the 2-parent families using their services and all of the 2-parent families on their waiting lists. In cases where a center refused to release family names another center was randomly selected from that sample area, and that center was contacted. It was not deemed necessary that a specific number of waiting list names be selected from Title IV-A or private centers as: (a) these parents had not yet experienced a specific day care program and (b) several centers were without waiting lists. It was desirable, however, that waiting list families at least

be distributed fairly evenly between the urban and rural population. Therefore, the design called for randomly selecting five 2-parent families from eight centers on the combined urban waiting lists and another 40 from the combined rural waiting lists. In some cases five 2-parent families were not available from a center and a name had to be drawn from another center in the same sample area; although most attending day care names were drawn successfully according to the 5 per center criteria, the original 32 centers did not have enough waiting list 2-parent families to satisfy the sample design. It was necessary to contact additional centers in the sample areas to obtain a sufficient number of 2-parent waiting list families; thus a final sample of 39 centers was needed.

The next step involved the interviewers in each sample area calling families and arranging for interviews. They were instructed to begin with the first name on their randomly ordered lists and continue until they had completed their assigned number of interviews. In a case where a family refused to be interviewed the interviewer was instructed to select the next name on the list. The available lists did supply an adequate number of randomized names.

Sample Bias

Two sources of bias in drawing the sample must be considered.

Center Bias. In locating the 39 centers willing to participate in the study, a few were approached who refused. It is possible that the families attending these centers had different day care experiences than those we interviewed. This bias would be most likely to occur in the case of private centers when the reluctance was greatest to release parents' names.

Family Bias. A similar problem occurred in contacting families. There were some refusals, predominately from those attending private urban centers. Although a sufficient number of these families did cooperate, a question arises of how the experience of the refusers might have differed.

Sample Characteristics

To date, 190 interviews have been coded and processed for analysis. Although the remaining 50 continue to filter in, it is necessary to make a preliminary analysis of the first 190 cases and at some later time update the analysis with the additional 50 cases. It is fortunate that the 190 cases distribute into the six sample cells approximately as the design for the total 240 calls for. The actual and ideal distribution is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
ACTUAL AND IDEAL DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

	Actual				Ideal			
	Urban		Rural		Urban		Rural	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Waiting list	23	12.1	35	18.4	40	16.6	40	16.6
Title IV-A day care	31	16.3	30	15.7	40	16.6	40	16.6
Private day care	34	17.8	37	19.4	40	16.6	40	16.6

Although we intended to include only 2-parent families, on several occasions the interviewers arrived at homes for interviews to find a couple separated (this change in status being recent and not known by the day care center which completed its list of 2-parent families).

One hundred and eighty-four 2-parent families and six mothers of 1-parent families were interviewed. The six 1-parent families were excluded from the analysis when they conflicted with the theoretical issues being examined, such as marital satisfaction.

Another characteristic omitted from the original design was racial group of families interviewed. Not enough was known about the population to include it as a criteria. The ethnic group of the families interviewed was recorded. For the total sample there were 27.9% blacks, 70% whites, and 2% other racial groups. The percentage of blacks was significantly higher than the percentage of blacks across Pennsylvania, which is 8.6%. A closer inspection of the sample along the urban-rural dimension shows that there were only 3.1% blacks in day care in the rural areas, while 56.8% were in day care in the urban areas of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, which have 26.4% and 16.7% blacks respectively in their general populations.

Although the high proportion of urban families and the higher percentage of blacks in urban areas account for some of the discrepancy between census data for Pennsylvania and our sample, there still appears to be a proportionately higher number of urban blacks in day care than urban blacks in the general population. It might be possible to hypothesize that the high percentage of urban blacks in day care is attributable to the Title IV-A regulations, which give priority to low income groups, and the high percentage of urban blacks in the low income groups. The proportions of urban blacks in private and Title IV-A day care were not equal. There were 29.5% blacks in private urban centers and 66.6% blacks in Title IV-A urban centers. It must be kept in mind, therefore, that when any urban-rural comparison of the data is made, it is really urban blacks and whites versus rural whites which is being considered.

Age. The average mother interviewed was 30.2 years of age, the youngest being 19 and the oldest 50 years old. Sixty-seven percent of the mothers were between the ages of 23.7 and 36.7 years. The average father was 33.8, the youngest being 21 years old and the oldest 72. Sixty-seven percent of the fathers were between the ages of 25.3 and 42.4.

Education. The average number of years of education completed by mothers was 11.9 with a range of 5 to 18 years. Sixty-seven percent of the mothers completed between 9.7 and 14.1 years of education. The average father completed 11.9 years of education with a range of 4 to 20 years of education. Sixty-seven percent of the fathers had completed between 8 and 14.6 years of education.

Table 5 gives the mean years of education completed by both the mothers and fathers in the various groups. The combined group of day care mothers completed significantly more years of education than the combined group of waiting list mothers (.05 level of significance). The same significant difference was found between the day care and waiting list groups of fathers. Within the day care group the difference between the mean years of education completed for the urban and rural groups of mothers was not significant (.05 level of significance), and the fathers' groups showed comparable results. Within the day care groups of mothers the private day care groups had completed significantly more years of education than the Title IV-A day care group (.05 level of significance); similar differences were found between the private and Title IV-A groups of fathers.

TABLE 5
MEAN YEARS OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

Group	Mothers	Fathers
Day care	12.14	12.16
Waiting list	11.34	11.20
Urban day care	12.40	12.25
Rural day care	11.89	12.08
Private day care	12.91	13.15
Title IV-A day care	11.25	11.08

Marriage. The couples interviewed were married an average of 8.8 years. The range was 1 to 29 years of marriage, with 67% of the couples being married between 3.2 and 14.5 years. It was the first marriage for over 80% of both men and women. No statistically significant differences (.05 level of significance) in the number of years married were found between the day care and waiting list groups, the urban and rural day care groups, or the Title IV-A and private day care groups (Table 6).

TABLE 6
MEAN NUMBER OF YEARS OF MARRIAGE

Day care	8.60
Waiting list	9.31
Urban day care	8.47
Rural day care	8.72
Private day care	8.76
Title IV-A day care	8.40

Family Employment. The rate of employment for the 190 families interviewed is represented in Table 7.

TABLE 7
FAMILY EMPLOYMENT OF ALL FAMILIES INTERVIEWED

	N	%
Husband and wife unemployed	19	10.0
Husband employed, wife unemployed	82	43.1
Husband unemployed, wife employed	5	2.63
Husband employed, wife employed	84	44.2

Two-spouse employment varied. The rate of employment for both spouses was notably higher for the day care group than the waiting list group, as indicated in Table 8 (.05 level of significance). There was a low rate of 2-spouse employment, 30.0%, among families using Title IV-A rural day care services (Table 9) and high unemployment for both spouses in the same group, i.e., 16.6% as opposed to 6.3% for the entire day care group. The Title IV-A urban group had 12.9% unemployment for both spouses, and, although the overall rate for day care families was 6.8%, all of the cases of 2-spouse unemployment occurred in the Title IV-A groups.

TABLE 8
TWO-SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT

	N	%
Day care group	71	53.7
Waiting list group	13	22.4

TABLE 9
RATE OF EMPLOYMENT

	Husband and Wife Unemployed		Husband Employed Wife Unemployed		Wife Employed Husband Unemployed		Husband and Wife Employed		Wife Employed Regardless of Husband	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Private rural	0	0	11	30.0	3	8.1	23	62.1	26	70.0
Title IV-A rural	5	16.6	16	53.3	0	0	9	30.0	9	30.0
Private urban	0	0	12	35.3	2	5.9	20	58.8	22	64.7
Title IV-A urban	4	12.9	8	29.0	0	0	19	61.2	19	61.2

For the overall sample 89 (45.7%) of the women were employed. The number of employed day care mothers, 76 (57.6%), was notably higher than the number of employed waiting list mothers, 13 (22.4%).

In only five families were the wives employed and not the husbands. All five occurred in the day care group.

Type of Employment. Table 10 presents a description of the types of employment represented. Of the 162 fathers presently employed 54.1% were rated as doing either unskilled manual or semiskilled manual work. Of the 93 women employed (or being trained while employed) only 34.4% were rated as unskilled manual or semiskilled manual workers. The main discrepancy between male and female occupations seems to lie in the greatest number of males in semiskilled manual jobs such as truck driver, steel worker, etc., while a greater number of females held semiskilled clerical jobs, such as typists and keypunch operators, and skilled clerical jobs, like private secretaries and salesclerks, and skilled technical or semiprofessional jobs, such as nurses, college students, and social workers.

TABLE 10
TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Type	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
1. Unskilled manual or household service	23	14.2	6	6.5
2. Semiskilled manual	67	41.4	26	27.9
3. Semiskilled clerical	11	6.8	19	20.4
4. Skilled-manual	16	9.9	3	3.2
5. Skilled clerical or subprofessional	9	5.5	18	19.4
6. Skilled technical or semiprofessional	9	5.5	20	21.5
7. Administrative, executive or business	12	7.4	1	1.1
8. Professional	14	8.6	0	0
9. Farmer; student below college level	1	.6	0	0

Socioeconomic Status. An index of socioeconomic status (SES) was constructed for mothers, fathers, and mothers and fathers combined. The index is a combination of education and job status scores arranged on an 8-point scale ranging from 0 to 7. Index numbers were grouped to represent lower, middle, and upper SES. Table 11 shows the number of families in each group. As demonstrated in Table 11, SES was quite similar for both the day care and waiting list groups.

A small discrepancy did occur. There were more low SES waiting list families and more high SES day care families. This finding may be attributable to the greater number of working wives in the day care group who got a higher job status rating than nonworking waiting list wives with 0 job status ratings due to present and past unemployment.

TABLE 11
SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

SES	Total Sample		Day Care		Waiting List	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low	84	44.4	57	43.5	27	46.5
Middle	92	48.7	63	48.0	29	50.0
High	13	6.9	11	8.3	2	3.4

T-tests were done to evaluate the difference between the means for SES scores. The following were the results:

a. The day care group was found to have a significantly higher mean SES than the waiting list group (.05 level of significance).

b. The private day care group was found to have a significantly higher mean SES than the Title IV-A day care group (.05 level of significance).

c. The urban day care group was found to have a significantly higher mean SES than the rural day care group (.05 level of significance). Table 12 indicates the mean SES scores for the four day care groups, the waiting list group and the total day care group.

TABLE 12
MEAN SES SCORES

Day care	3.11
Waiting list	2.58
Private rural	3.56
Title IV-A rural	2.80
Private urban	3.91
Title IV-A urban	3.48

Family Income. The total average family income for the 163 families which responded fully to the income question was \$8,061. Sixty-seven percent of those responding had incomes between \$4,454 and \$11,668 a year. The median income for the group was \$7,200 a year. Table 13 illustrates the group size for different income ranges.

TABLE 13
SIZE OF DIFFERENT INCOME RANGES

Income	N	%
Under 3,000	2	1.2
3,000-4,999	25	15.4
5,000-6,999	47	29.0
7,000-9,999	48	29.4
10,000-14,999	32	19.6
15,000 and over	9	5.5

The mean annual incomes varied from group to group. Those of the six sample groups are indicated in Table 14. For the combined day care groups the mean was \$8,679, and that of the combined waiting list groups was \$6,780. The day care group was found to have a significantly higher annual income than the waiting list group (.05 level of significance). The mean annual income for the private day care groups combined was \$9,694, while that of the Title IV-A day care groups combined was \$7,698. The private day care group was found to have a significantly higher annual income than the Title IV-A day care group (.05 level of significance). The mean annual income for the urban day care groups combined was \$9,598, and that for the rural day care groups combined was \$7,883. The mean

annual income of the combined urban day care groups was found to be significantly higher than the mean annual income of the combined rural day care groups (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 14
MEAN ANNUAL INCOME IN DOLLARS

Private rural day care	8,869
Title IV-A rural day care	6,864
Private urban day care	10,725
Title IV-A urban day care	8,592
Rural waiting	6,420
Urban waiting	7,320

Families on Welfare. A total of 36 (22.0%) families of the 163 who gave complete financial information were receiving some monetary assistance from the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare. The waiting list group was found to have a significantly larger number of families receiving these funds than the day care group (.05 level of significance) (Table 15).

TABLE 15
FAMILIES RECEIVING WELFARE FUNDS

	N	%
Day care	18	16.0
Waiting list	18	35.0

Since only 10% of the families interviewed had both spouses entirely unemployed, we can assume that many families were using welfare funds as income supplements rather than as entire income sources.

There was no significant difference between the number of urban and rural day care families using welfare funds (.05 level of significance), but the Title IV-A group was found to have a significantly greater number of families using welfare funds than the private group (.05 level of significance) (Table 16). Much of the difference between Title IV-A and private day care families in the usage of funds seems to be attributable to the high rate of Title IV-A rural families using welfare funds. The high rate of Title IV-A rural families on welfare corresponds, as would be expected, to the high percentage of Title IV-A rural families with both spouses unemployed (16.6%) and the low percentage of Title IV-A rural families with both spouses employed (30.0%).

TABLE 16
DAY CARE FAMILIES USING WELFARE FUNDS

	N	%
Title IV-A urban	5	18.5
Title IV-A rural	11	38.9
Private urban	1	3.7
Private rural	1	4.1

Day Care Children in Sample

Of the 190 families interviewed a total of 540 children under the age of 18 years were recorded, resulting in an average of 2.8 children under 18 years per family. This figure is somewhat higher than the national average of 2.3 children per family.

There were 136 families presently using day care services and 58 families were awaiting the use of such services. Only 54 families, however, were totally without the use of day care services as four families both had children in day care and were awaiting the service for additional children. These families were excluded from the analysis due to the confusion caused by their dual classification, both using day care and on the waiting list. The day care families interviewed ranged from having 0 to 3 children in day care. Table 17 indicates the distribution.

TABLE 17
NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY IN DAY CARE

	n	%
No children	53	28
One child in day care	113	59
Two children in day care	23	12
Three children in day care	1	1

There were 162 children, or 30% of the total children recorded, attending day care centers. Seventy-nine were female and 83 were male.

Ages of Day Care Children. Children attending day care centers ranged from age 3 to 12 years, with 83% of the children being between the ages of 3 and 5 years. Table 18 provides a fuller description of the age distribution.

TABLE 18
NUMBER OF DAY CARE CHILDREN BY AGE

Age	N	%
3	22	14
4	69	43
5	42	26
6	12	4
7	7	4
8	3	2
9	3	2
10	1	1
11	2	1
12	1	1

Months in Day Care. The average day care child of the day care families had attended day care for 14 months. Table 19 reveals, however, that the average number of months in day care was elevated by a few extreme cases. The median number of months for children attending day care was 8 months. Sixty-seven percent of the children had been attending a day care center for 1 year or less.

Hours Per Week in Day Care. The average number of hours per week for a child of a day care family attending day care was 29 with a median of 32 hours a week. As indicated in Table 20, 23% of the children spent 15 hours or less a week at the center, and 64% were there for 30 or more hours a week.

TABLE 19
MONTHS IN DAY CARE

Months	N	%
0-3	11	7.0
4-6	39	24.8
7-9	35	22.3
10-12	23	14.6
13-15	9	5.7
16-20	9	5.7
21-24	14	8.9
25-30	2	1.3
31-36	6	3.8
37-42	2	1.3
43-60	5	3.2
61-72	2	1.3

TABLE 20
NUMBER OF HOURS IN DAY CARE PER WEEK

Hours	N	% of Day Care Children
1-15	35	22.3
16-19	22	14.0
30 and above	100	63.7

RESULTS

Parent Participation in Day Care

The series of questions designed to evaluate parent participation fall into two main categories. The first category provided open-ended opportunities for parents to list what they felt had been their participation activities and the extent to which they had performed them; these responses will be called cited activities. The second group listed a great number of possible participation activities, and parents were able to say in which they had participated and to what extent; these activities will be called acknowledged activities. Those activities originally cited by parents have been reviewed first, those acknowledged by parents are second, a consideration of an overall index of participation is made third, and fourth possible influences on participation, other than type of center, are discussed.

Activities Cited by Parents

Parents were given the opportunity to cite any day care participation activity in which they were involved during the 6 months prior to the interview. The activities cited are first considered in relation to their number, and secondly they are discussed with type of participation also being included.

Number of Activities Cited. When asked to cite participation activities, both mothers and fathers ranged from being able to name 0 to 4 activities. Table 21 indicates the number of mothers and fathers who could name 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 activities. Of the mothers using day care 47.0% were not able to recall any participation activity, and another

30.0% were able to recall only one activity over a 6-month period. Seventy-eight percent of the fathers were unable to recall any participation activity, and another 16.3% were only able to recall one activity over a 6-month period.

TABLE 21
NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES CITED

Activities	Mothers		Fathers	
	N	%	N	%
0	62	47.0	96	78.0
1	40	30.3	20	16.3
2	21	15.9	4	3.3
3	7	5.3	2	1.6
4	2	1.5	1	.8

Participation by Group. Each parent was given a score from 0 to 4 indicating the number of participation activities they were able to name. Mean scores were calculated for various breakdowns within the day care groups as indicated on Table 22.

T-tests were done to evaluate the differences between the means for amount of participation for mothers with the following results:

a. No significant difference was found between the number of participation activities for the urban group and the rural group (.05 level of significance).

b. No significant difference was found between the number of participation activities for the private group and the Title IV-A group (.05 level of significance).

c. The Title IV-A rural group mean was found to be significantly greater than the private rural group mean (.05 level of significance).

d. No significant difference was found between the mean number of activities named by the Title IV-A urban and private urban groups (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 22
AMOUNT OF CITED PARTICIPATION
Group Means

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	.95	.38
Rural	.73	.24
Title IV-A	.96	.20
Private	.73	.41
Private rural	.40	.23
Title IV-A rural	1.13	.25
Private urban	1.08	.60
Title IV-A urban	.80	.16

T-tests for the difference between means for the amount of participation were performed to evaluate differences within the day care fathers' group with the following results:

a. No significant difference was found between the means for the urban and rural groups (.05 level of significance).

b. No significant difference was found between the means for the private and Title IV-A groups (.05 level of significance).

c. No significant difference was found between the means for private rural and Title IV-A rural groups (.05 level of significance).

d. The private urban group was found to have a significantly higher mean than the Title IV-A urban group (.05 level of significance).

Type of Activities Cited. Participation activities cited were rated according to a 5-point scale (Gordon 1969). Each number represents a degree of involvement with the children or with making decisions related to the children. The five levels of involvement are:

1. Parents as supporters - service givers - facilitations - clerical, custodial, maintenance, fund raising, family nights.
2. Parents as learners - parent education courses, observation of children with explanation.
3. Parents as teachers of their own children - taking home toys and books for use with children.
4. Parents as teacher aides and volunteers in the classroom - prepare materials, read stories, work with children.
5. Parents as policy makers and partners - policy makers, advisory board members [p. 274].

Table 23 shows the distribution of the parents along the 5-point scale.

TABLE 23
LEVEL OF ACTIVITY

Level	Mothers		Fathers	
	N	% of total	N	% of total
1	84	75.6	31	79.5
2	2	1.8	2	5.1
3	0	0	0	0
4	11	9.9	1	2.6
5	14	12.6	5	12.8

Level of Activity by Group. The level of activity was also considered across groups. For this purpose, all activity scores were combined for each group to determine a mean score for each group with a range of 0-20, or least active to most active. Table 24 indicates the mean scores for the four day care groups and combinations of those groups for mothers and fathers.

TABLE 24
LEVEL OF CITED PARTICIPATION
Group Means

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	1.52	.69
Rural	1.53	.32
Title IV-A	2.18	.27
Private	.97	.71
Private rural	.43	.26
Title IV-A rural	2.86	.39
Private urban	1.55	1.23
Title IV-A urban	1.51	.16

The same group comparisons as were made for the amount of participation were made for the level, or degree, of participation. Using T-tests to determine the difference between two means for the degree of participation of mothers produced the following results:

a. As in the case of the amount of participation there was no significant difference between the means of urban and rural groups when they were compared for the amount and degree of participation (.05 level of significance).

b. Although there was no difference in the means of the private and Title IV-A groups when they were compared for the amount of participation, when they were weighted for degree, the Title IV-A group was found to have a significantly higher mean than the private group (.05 level of significance).

c. As in the case of the comparison for the amount of participation, when groups were weighted for degree of participation, the Title IV-A rural group had a significantly higher mean than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).

d. As in the case of the comparison for the amount of participation, when groups were weighted for degree of participation, no significant difference appeared between the mean scores of the private urban and Title IV-A urban groups (.05 level of significance).

The T-tests for the difference between two means for the degree of participation produced the following results for fathers:

a. As in the comparison for the amount of participation, no significant difference was found between the urban and rural group means for degree of participation (.05 level of significance).

b. As in the case for amount of participation, there was no significant difference in the means of degree of participation for the private group and Title IV-A group (.05 level of significance).

c. As in the case of the amount of participation, there was no significant difference between the means for the private rural and Title IV-A rural groups when scores were weighted for the degree of participation (.05 level of significance).

d. As in the case of amount of participation, when scores were weighted for degree, the private urban group was found to have a significantly higher mean than the Title IV-A urban group (.05 level of significance).

Activities Acknowledged by Parents

An extensive list of participation activities were enumerated for the respondents, who were asked to give information as to whether they participated in each activity and how frequently. Each activity enumerated for both the husband and wife has been described so as to provide a general view of the kinds and extent of participation activities at the four types of day care centers.

Social Activities. Parents were questioned concerning their participation in various social activities at their child's day care center during the 6 months prior to the interview. Table 25 indicates the distribution of mothers and fathers who participated in such activities.

All social activities for each respondent were added to provide a social activity index with the range of 0 to 4. The mean social activity index numbers for various breakdowns within the day care groups of mothers and fathers are indicated in Table 26.

T-tests were performed for the mothers' groups to evaluate differences between the means of social activities. Significant differences were found between the means of the following comparisons.

a. Urban day care mothers vs. rural day care mothers (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 25
SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Family days	2	5.4	3	10.0	2	5.8	4	12.9	11	8.3
Picnics	1	2.7	5	16.6	2	5.8	3	9.6	11	8.3
Programs by children	3	8.1	5	16.6	3	23.5	4	12.9	20	17.4
Coffee hours	4	10.8	1	3.3	4	11.7	3	9.6	12	9.0
Fathers										
Family days	1	2.9	2	7.1	3	10.0	1	3.2	7	5.7
Picnics	0	0.0	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Programs by children	2	5.9	2	7.1	6	20.0	3	9.6	13	10.5
Coffee hours	1	2.9	2	7.1	3	10.0	1	3.2	7	5.7

TABLE 26
SOCIAL ACTIVITIES INDEX
Group Means

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	.46	.28
Rural	.35	.18
Private	.36	.20
Title IV-A	.45	.25
Private rural	.27	.12
Title IV-A rural	.46	.25
Private urban	.47	.40
Title IV-A urban	.45	.16

b. Private day care mothers vs. Title IV-A day care mothers (.05 level of significance).

c. Private rural day care mothers vs. Title IV-A rural day care mothers (.05 level of significance).

d. Private urban day care mothers vs. Title IV-A urban day care mothers (.05 level of significance).

T-tests were also performed to evaluate differences between the means of social activities for the fathers' groups, and again there were no significant differences for the following comparisons:

a. Urban day care fathers vs. rural day care fathers (.05 level of significance).

b. Private day care fathers vs. Title IV-A day care fathers (.05 level of significance).

c. Title IV-A rural day care fathers vs. private rural day care fathers (.05 level of significance).

d. Private urban day care fathers vs. Title IV-A urban day care fathers (.05 level of significance).

Continuing Group Membership. Parents were questioned concerning their membership in various continuing groups at the center during the 6 months prior to the interview. Table 27 indicates the membership of mothers and fathers of each day care group type.

All group membership activities for each respondent were added to provide a group membership index score ranging from 0 to 4. The mean group membership scores for various breakdowns within the mothers' and fathers' groups are indicated in Table 28.

TABLE 27
CONTINUING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Fund raising	3	8.1	14	46.6	4	11.7	5	16.1	26	19.6
Social	1	2.7	0	0.0	2	5.8	3	9.6	6	4.5
Mothers'	0	0.0	8	26.6	2	5.8	5	16.1	15	11.3
Parent involvement	2	5.4	9	20.0	6	17.6	10	33.3	27	20.4
Fathers										
Fund raising	3	8.8	4	14.3	7	23.3	3	9.6	17	13.8
Social	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	0.8
Fathers'	0	0.0	2	7.1	1	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.4
Parent involvement	1	2.9	0	0.0	4	13.3	1	3.2	6	4.9

TABLE 28
MEAN GROUP MEMBERSHIP SCORES

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	.56	.29
Rural	.55	.16
Title IV-A	.88	.16
Private	.28	.28
Private rural	.16	.11
Title IV-A rural	1.03	.21
Private urban	.41	.46
Title IV-A urban	.74	.13

T-tests for the difference between means for group membership were done to evaluate the differences within the mothers' groups with the following results:

- a. There was no significant difference between the mean scores for the urban group of mothers and the rural mothers' group (.05 level of significance).
- b. The Title IV-A mothers' group did have a significantly higher mean than the private group of mothers (.05 level of significance).
- c. The Title IV-A rural mothers' group had a significantly higher mean than the private rural mothers' group (.05 level of significance).
- d. There was no significant difference between the means for the Title IV-A and private urban mothers' groups (.05 level of significance).

To determine the differences between two means for group membership T-tests within the fathers' groups were performed. The results were:

- a. There was no significant difference between the mean scores for the urban and rural fathers' groups (.05 level of significance).
- b. There was no significant difference between the means scores for the Title IV-A and private fathers' groups (.05 level of significance).
- c. There was no significant difference between the mean scores for the Title IV-A and private rural fathers' groups (.05 level of significance).
- d. There was no significant difference between the mean scores for the private urban fathers' group and the Title IV-A urban fathers' group (.05 level of significance).

Volunteer Activities. Parents were interviewed concerning their volunteer activities at the day care center during the 6 months prior

to the interview. Table 29 indicates the number of mothers and fathers who worked within various volunteer capacities.

TABLE 29
VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Babysitter	0	0.0	5	16.6	0	0.0	1	3.2	6	4.5
Kitchen helper	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	1.5
Transportation driver	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.8	0	0.0	2	1.5
Clerical worker	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	0.8
Maintenance	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.8	3	9.6	5	3.7
Shop for supplies	0	0.0	7	23.3	6	17.6	4	12.9	17	12.8
Fund raiser	1	2.7	3	10.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	5	3.7
Storyteller	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	0.8
Recruiter of other volunteers	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Fathers										
Babysitter	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	0.8
Kitchen helper	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Transportation driver	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Clerical worker	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Maintenance	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	2	6.5	3	2.4
Shop for supplies	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	0.8
Fund raiser	0	0.0	2	7.1	4	13.3	3	9.7	9	7.3
Storyteller	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Recruiter of other volunteers	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	0.8

Each mother and father was given a score ranging from 0 to 9 indicating the number of volunteer activities in which he or she participated. Table 30 indicates the mean scores for volunteer activities for various breakdowns within the day care mothers' and fathers' groups.

TABLE 30
VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES
Group Means

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	.34	.19
Rural	.25	.06
Title IV-A	.43	.15
Private	.18	.11
Private rural	.03	.00
Title IV-A rural	.53	.14
Private urban	.35	.23
Title IV-A urban	.32	.14

T-tests for the differences between two means within the mothers' day care groups for volunteer activities produced the following results:

- a. No significant difference was found between the means for the urban and rural groups (.05 level of significance).
- b. No significant difference was found between the means for the Title IV-A and private groups (.05 level of significance).
- c. The Title IV-A rural group was found to have a significantly higher mean than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).
- d. No significant difference was found between the means for the Title IV-A and private urban groups (.05 level of significance).

The following results were obtained when T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate differences within the fathers' groups for volunteer activities:

a. No significant difference was found between the group means for urban and rural groups (.05 level of significance).

b. No significant difference was found between the group means for the Title IV-A and private groups (.05 level of significance).

c. The Title IV-A rural group had a significantly higher mean than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).

d. No significant difference was found between the means for the private urban and Title IV-A urban groups (.05 level of significance).

Professional-Semiprofessional Activities. Parents were questioned about their activities at the center in professional or semiprofessional capacities during the 6 months prior to the interview. Table 31 indicates the number of mothers participating in these activities by day care group. Five of the six activities in this group took place at Title IV-A centers.

TABLE 31
PROFESSIONAL OR SEMIPROFESSIONAL
ACTIVITIES OF THE MOTHERS

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher or teacher aide	0	0.0	3	10.0	0	0.0	2	6.4	5	3.7
Social case worker or aide	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	0.8
Nurse or aide	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nutritionist or aide	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Director of center	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Professional or semiprofessional volunteer or paid activity scores ranging from 0-5 were calculated for mothers by summing all scores for the activities indicated on Table 31. Table 32 presents the means for these scores for various breakdowns within the day care mothers' group.

TABLE 32
PROFESSIONAL OR SEMIPROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY
SCORES OF THE MOTHERS
Group Means

Urban	.05
Rural	.04
Title IV-A	.08
Private	.01
Private rural	.00
Title IV-A rural	.10
Private urban	.03
Title IV-A urban	.06

T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate differences between the groups of mothers for professional or semiprofessional activity. No significant differences were found when the following comparisons were made:

- a. Urban vs. rural (.05 level of significance).
- b. Title IV-A vs. private (.05 level of significance).
- c. Title IV-A rural vs. private rural (.05 level of significance).
- d. Title IV-A urban vs. private urban (.05 level of significance).

Two fathers in the Title IV-A rural classification, and one urban private father, were classified as working as a teacher or teacher's aide. No other fathers were recorded as working in any professional or semiprofessional capacity. Due to the lack of participation of fathers in this area no group means were calculated.

In only three cases were parents given training to help them fill a professional or semiprofessional position, and in no cases were they given raises or promotions.

Activities Prior to the Opening of the Day Care Centers. Parents were questioned about any participation which might have taken place before the opening of their centers. Table 33 indicates the various ways in which mothers and fathers in each group were involved.

TABLE 33
PARTICIPATION PRIOR TO THE OPENING OF THE CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Answered questions	2	5.4	3	10.0	6	17.6	3	9.6	14	10.6
Planned center activities	1	2.7	2	6.6	2	5.8	1	3.2	6	4.5
Raised funds	1	2.7	1	3.3	3	8.8	0	0.0	5	3.8
Did other things	1	2.7	1	3.3	2	5.8	0	0.0	4	3.0
Fathers										
Answered questions	1	2.9	0	0.0	3	10.0	0	0.0	4	3.3
Planned center activities	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.7	0	0.0	2	1.6
Raised funds	1	2.9	0	0.0	4	13.3	0	0.0	5	4.1
Did other things	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	6.7	0	0.0	3	2.4

All center initiation activity scores were summed for each respondent to produce a center initiation score. Table 34 indicates the mean center initiation scores for mothers and fathers for different breakdowns within the mothers' and fathers' groups.

TABLE 34
CENTER INITIATION SCORES

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	.18	.02
Rural	.10	.02
Title IV-A	.16	.02
Private	.12	.02
Private rural	.03	.06
Title IV-A rural	.20	.00
Private urban	.23	.30
Title IV-A urban	.13	.00

T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate differences between the groups of mothers concerning their participation in activities prior to the opening of the center. No significant differences were found in any of the following group comparisons:

- a. Urban vs. rural (.05 level of significance).
- b. Title IV-A vs. private (.05 level of significance).
- c. Title IV-A rural vs. private rural (.05 level of significance).
- d. Private urban vs. Title IV-A urban (.05 level of significance).

The following resulted when T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate group differences for fathers in their participation in activities before the opening of the center:

a. No significant difference was found between the mean scores for the urban and rural groups (.05 level of significance).

b. No significant difference was found between the mean scores for the Title IV-A and private groups (.05 level of significance).

c. No significant difference was found between the mean scores for the Title IV-A rural and private rural groups (.05 level of significance).

d. The private urban group was found to have a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A urban group (.05 level of significance).

Advisory Board Membership. Parents were questioned about their membership on advisory boards at their centers. Twenty (15.1%) of the mothers claimed such membership either presently or in the past, while five (4.1%) of the fathers made such a claim. Table 35 demonstrates the total present or past membership of mothers and fathers in each day care group.

TABLE 35

TOTAL PRESENT OR PAST MEMBERSHIP ON ADVISORY BOARDS

	Mothers		Fathers	
	N	%	N	%
Private rural	1	2.7	0	0.0
Title IV-A rural	7	23.3	1	3.6
Private urban	6	17.6	4	13.3
Title IV-A urban	6	19.4	0	0.0

Binomial confidence intervals for the difference in advisory board membership between two percentages were done to evaluate differences of

percentages of mothers belonging within different breakdowns of the mothers' group. The results were the following:

- a. No significant difference occurred between the percentages belonging to urban and rural groups (.05 level of significance).
- b. No significant difference was found between the percentages belonging to Title IV-A and private groups (.05 level of significance).
- c. There was a significantly higher percentage of mothers belonging in the Title IV-A rural group than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).
- d. There was no significant difference in the percentage of group membership for the private and Title IV-A urban groups (.05 level of significance).

Data for fathers were analyzed in the same manner with the following results:

- a. There was no significant difference between membership for the urban and rural groups (.05 level of significance).
- b. There was no significant difference between membership for the Title IV-A and private groups (.05 level of significance).
- c. There was no significant difference between Title IV-A and private rural membership (.05 level of significance).
- d. Private urban fathers had significantly higher membership than Title IV-A urban fathers (.05 level of significance).

Of the 25 parents who were advisory board members, two private urban mothers and one private urban father had held some office on the board.

Parent Education. Information was also sought on the number of parents who took parent education courses at their center. Table 36 indicates the number of mothers and fathers who took such courses. Due to the low number of parents in any group taking courses, no difference between the groups were computed.

TABLE 36
PARENT EDUCATION COURSES

Courses	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Housekeeping	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	0.8
Child rearing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.4	2	1.5
Other	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Fathers										
Housekeeping	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Child rearing	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.6	0	0.0	2	1.6
Other	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8

When asked whether any services, such as transportation, payment, babysitting, lunch or dinner, or being able to choose the time, made the taking of parent education courses easier, two Title IV-A urban mothers and one private urban father cited choosing the time as helpful. No other such services were used.

Toys and Books for Home Use. Parents were asked if they had been given any toys or books to use at home with their children and whether they were given any instructions for their use. Table 37 indicates the mothers' and fathers' responses to this question.

TABLE 37
TOYS AND BOOKS PROVIDED FOR USE AT HOME

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title I'-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Given toys	2	5.4	4	13.3	10	29.4	3	9.6	19	14.3
Given toys with instructions	1	2.7	0	0.0	4	11.7	1	3.2	6	4.5
Given books	1	2.7	3	10.0	3	8.8	5	16.1	12	9.0
Given books with instructions	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	2	6.4	3	2.3
Fathers										
Given toys	1	2.9	3	10.7	6	20.0	1	3.2	11	8.9
Given toys with instructions	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	6.7	0	0.0	3	2.4
Given books	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	6.7	3	9.7	6	4.9
Given books with instructions	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8

Binomial confidence intervals for the difference between two percentages were computed to evaluate group differences in use of toys for the mothers.

The results were the following:

- a. No significant difference was found between the percentage of urban and rural mothers receiving toys (.05 level of significance).

b. No significant difference was found between the percentage of private and Title IV-A mothers receiving toys (.05 level of significance).

c. No significant difference was found between the percentage of private rural and Title IV-A rural mothers receiving toys (.05 level of significance).

d. A significantly greater percentage of private urban than Title IV-A urban mothers received toys (.05 level of significance).

Differences between groups for toys with instructions was not calculated due to the low total number of mothers using such services. Neither were the differences between groups for those given books or books with instructions calculated due to the small total percentage of mothers using these services.

Differences between groups for fathers were not calculated due to the total low percentage of fathers using books or toys.

Instructions given to the parents were oral in all cases but three. In those three exceptions they were written.

Observation of Children. Information was obtained as to whether parents were able to come to the center to observe their children and whether a staff member was there to explain their child's activities. Table 38 summarizes the mothers' and fathers' responses to this question. All groups had a high participation rate in this area.

No significant differences were found between the following groups in the percentage of mothers observing their children.

a. Urban vs. rural (.05 level of significance).

b. ~~Title~~ IV-A vs. private (.05 level of significance).

- c. Private rural vs. Title IV-A rural (.05 level of significance).
- d. Private urban vs. Title IV-A urban (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 38
OBSERVATION OF CHILDREN AT CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Observed	26	70.3	23	76.7	26	76.5	27	87.1	102	77.3
Observed with explanation	20	54.1	23	76.7	20	58.8	24	77.4	87	65.9
Fathers										
Observed	18	52.9	7	25.0	22	73.3	16	51.6	63	51.2
Observed with explanation	16	47.1	7	25.0	15	50.0	16	51.6	54	43.9

A comparison of mothers observing with explanation from the teacher produced the following results:

- a. Title IV-A centers were found to have a significantly higher number of mothers who observed with staff explanation than private centers (.05 level of significance).
- b. There was no significant difference between the percentage of mothers in the urban and rural groups who observed with staff explanation (.05 level of significance).
- c. There was no significant difference between the percentage of mothers in the Title IV-A and private urban groups who observed with staff explanation (.05 level of significance).

d. The Title IV-A rural group was found to have a significantly higher number of mothers who observed with staff explanation than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).

Binomial confidence intervals for the difference between two percentages were computed to analyze differences in observation within the fathers' groups. The following were the results:

a. The urban group had a significantly higher percentage of fathers observing than the rural group (.05 level of significance).

b. The private group had a significantly higher percentage of fathers participating than the Title IV-A group (.05 level of significance).

c. The private rural group had a significantly higher percentage of the fathers observing than the Title IV-A rural group (.05 level of significance).

d. There was no significant difference between the percentage of private and Title IV-A urban fathers who observed (.05 level of significance).

Binomial confidence intervals were computed to analyze differences between groups of fathers who observed with staff explanation with the following results:

a. There was no significant difference between the percentage of urban and rural fathers observing with explanation (.05 level of significance).

b. There was no significant difference between the percentage of private and Title IV-A fathers who observed with explanation (.05 level of significance).

c. No significant difference was found between the percentage of those observing with explanation in the Title IV-A and private rural groups (.05 level of significance).

d. There was no significant difference between the percentage of those observing with explanation in the Title IV-A and private urban groups (.05 level of significance).

Parents Contacted by Center. We felt it necessary to determine not only whether parents observed their children's activities but also whether the day care center contacted parents to discuss their child and his activities. Table 39 indicates the number of mothers and fathers in each group who were contacted during the 6 months prior to the interview and by what method.

The difference between percentage of the total group contacted for the four day care mothers' groups were calculated. The calculation resulted in the following:

a. There was no significant difference between the percentage of urban and rural mothers contacted (.05 level of significance).

b. The Title IV-A group had a significantly higher percentage of mothers contacted than the private group (.05 level of significance).

c. The Title IV-A rural group had a significantly higher percentage of mothers contacted than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).

d. The Title IV-A urban group had a significantly higher percentage of mothers contacted than the private urban group (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 39
PARENTS CONTACTED BY CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Never contacted	20	54.0	3	10.0	13	38.2	5	16.1	41	31.0
Contacted at center	13	35.1	12	40.0	16	47.1	14	45.2	55	41.6
Someone from center came to home	2	5.4	7	23.0	2	5.9	7	22.6	18	13.6
Called on phone	2	5.4	8	26.0	3	8.8	5	16.1	18	13.6
Total contacted	17	45.9	27	90.0	21	61.7	26	83.8	91	68.9
Fathers										
Never contacted	21	61.7	17	60.7	15	50.0	18	58.1	71	57.7
Contacted at center	10	29.4	5	17.9	13	43.3	9	29.0	37	30.1
Someone from center came to home	2	5.9	3	10.7	1	3.3	2	6.5	8	6.5
Called on phone	1	2.9	3	10.7	1	3.3	1	3.2	6	4.9
Total contacted	13	38.2	11	39.3	15	50.0	13	38.7	52	41.5

A comparable analysis was done on data concerning fathers contacted.

a. A significantly higher percentage of urban fathers were contacted than rural fathers (.05 level of significance).

b. There was no significant difference between the percentage of private and Title IV-A fathers who were contacted (.05 level of significance).

c. There was no significant difference between the percentage of Title IV-A and private rural fathers contacted (.05 level of significance).

d. There was no significant difference between the percentage of Title IV-A and private urban fathers contacted (.05 level of significance).

Parents were further questioned as to how they were kept informed by their centers. Table 40 summarizes the manner in which day care mothers and fathers were informed.

TABLE 40
COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN PARENTS AND CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Newsletters	9	24.3	18	60.0	11	32.3	7	22.5	45	34.0
Parent-teacher meetings	4	10.8	19	63.3	8	23.5	22	70.9	53	40.1
Letters	18	48.6	26	86.6	24	70.5	23	74.1	91	68.9
Parent days	0	0.0	5	16.6	4	11.7	5	16.1	14	10.6
Meeting with director	3	8.1	10	33.3	5	14.7	8	25.8	26	19.6
Meeting with social worker	0	0.0	2	6.6	3	8.8	14	45.1	19	14.3
Fathers										
Newsletters	5	14.7	14	50.0	8	26.7	9	29.0	36	29.3
Parent-teacher meetings	1	2.9	10	35.7	7	23.3	11	35.5	29	23.6
Letters	9	26.5	12	42.9	20	66.7	19	61.3	60	48.8
Parent days	0	0.0	4	14.3	8	26.7	3	9.7	15	12.2
Meeting with director	4	11.8	3	10.7	3	10.0	4	12.9	14	11.4
Meeting with social worker	0	0.0	4	14.3	3	10.0	3	9.7	10	8.1

Each parent was given a score ranging from 0 to 6 representing a sum of all the types of communications received. Table 41 indicates the mean communication scores for the day care mothers' and fathers' groups.

TABLE 41
MEAN COMMUNICATION SCORES

	Mothers	Fathers
Title IV-A	2.61	1.62
Private	1.27	1.06
Urban	2.07	1.64
Rural	1.70	1.06
Private rural	.92	.56
Title IV-A rural	2.67	1.68
Private urban	1.65	1.63
Title IV-A urban	2.55	1.61

T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate differences in communications between the groups of mothers with the following results:

- a. The Title IV-A group mean was significantly higher than the private group mean (.05 level of significance).
- b. There was no significant difference between the rural group or urban group means (.05 level of significance).
- c. The Title IV-A rural group mean was significantly higher than the private rural group mean (.05 level of significance).
- d. The Title IV-A urban group mean was significantly higher than the private urban group mean (.05 level of significance).

T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate differences in communications between groups of fathers. The results were the following:

a. The Title IV-A group mean was significantly higher than the private group mean (.05 level of significance).

b. The urban group mean was significantly higher than the rural group mean (.05 level of significance).

c. The Title IV-A rural group mean was significantly higher than the private rural group mean.

d. There was no significant difference between the Title IV-A and private urban groups.

Table 42 indicates how frequently the total group of mothers and the total group of fathers received communication from the center. It shows that most information that is received comes on a once or twice monthly basis.

Services Offered at Center. Parents were questioned as to what service they might have used which was offered by their center. Table 43 indicates the number of mothers by group using various services. One father in the Title IV-A urban group used marriage counseling services. The number of parents using these services was too small to do any further analysis.

TABLE 42
FREQUENCY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH CENTER

	Never		Once or Twice		Monthly		Twice Monthly		Weekly	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Newsletter	86	65.5	11	8.4	20	15.3	7	5.3	7	5.3
Parent-teacher meetings	79	59.8	13	9.8	34	25.8	6	4.5	0	0.0
Letters	41	31.1	58	43.9	13	9.8	6	4.5	14	10.6
Parent days	118	89.4	9	6.8	4	3.0	1	0.8	0	0.0
Meeting with director	106	80.3	17	12.9	5	3.8	2	1.5	2	1.5
Meeting with social worker	113	85.6	11	8.3	4	3.0	2	1.5	2	1.5
Fathers										
Newsletter	87	70.7	6	4.9	15	12.1	8	6.5	7	5.7
Parent-teacher meetings	93	73.2	8	6.5	18	14.6	2	1.6	1	0.8
Letters	63	51.2	32	26.0	11	8.9	7	5.7	10	8.1
Parent days	108	87.8	10	8.1	3	2.4	2	1.6	0	0.0
Meeting with director	109	88.6	7	5.7	4	3.3	0	0.0	3	2.4
Meeting with social worker	113	91.8	5	4.1	2	1.6	0	0.0	3	2.4

TABLE 43
SERVICES UTILIZED AT DAY CARE CENTER BY MOTHERS

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Job counseling	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Marriage	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	1	0.8
Financial	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9	2	5.8	3	2.3
Health	0	0.0	2	6.6	0	0.0	1	2.9	3	2.3
Job training	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Prenatal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Family planning	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Referred Services. Parents were questioned further as to what services in their community they were referred by their day care center. Table 44 indicates the distribution for mothers and fathers. The number of parents using these services in each group were again too small for comparison.

TABLE 44
COMMUNITY SERVICES REFERRED TO BY DAY CARE CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Homemaker	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Job training	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mental health	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	1.5
Physical health	0	0.0	2	7.2	3	8.8	1	3.2	6	4.5
Legal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Housing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Family planning	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Fathers										
Homemaker	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Job training	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Mental health	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Physical health	0	0.0	1	3.6	2	6.7	0	0.0	3	2.4
Legal	0	0.0	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Housing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Family planning	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Complaints Concerning the Day Care Center. Parents were asked about complaints concerning their day care center because bringing the complaint to the center was considered to be a form of participation. Table 45 indicates the distribution of mothers and fathers across groups. Five

mothers (3.8%) and four fathers (3.3%) complained about the lack of parent participation. Forty (78.4%) of the mothers with complaints did bring their complaints to the center, and 13 (44.8%) of the total group of fathers with complaints also confronted the day care center.

TABLE 45
COMPLAINTS CONCERNING CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Had complaints	10	27.0	7	23.3	19	55.8	15	48.3	51	38.6
Brought to center	7	18.9	5	16.7	16	47.1	12	38.7	40	30.3
Fathers										
Had complaints	7	20.6	4	14.3	12	40.0	6	19.4	29	23.6
Brought to center	3	8.8	0	0.0	7	13.3	3	9.7	13	10.6

Complaints were handled either by center supervisors or by teachers.

Statistical analysis gave some interesting results. A significantly greater number of urban rather than rural mothers both had complaints and voiced them (.05 level of significance), although there were no Title IV-A vs. private differences. In the case of fathers, there were no significant differences in the percentage of fathers with complaints in each group, but a significantly higher number of urban rather than rural fathers voiced their complaints to the center (.05 level of significance). There were no Title IV-A vs. private differences.

The parents who brought a complaint to the center were questioned as to how satisfied they were with its resolution. Table 46 indicates the

level of satisfaction for mothers and fathers across groups. The total group of mothers was rather evenly distributed across levels of satisfaction.

TABLE 46
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

How satisfied	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%*
Mothers										
Not at all	1	14.3	1	20.0	1	6.3	5	41.7	8	20.0
Not very	1	14.3	2	40.0	4	25.0	4	33.3	11	27.5
Moderately	2	28.6	1	20.0	3	18.8	2	16.7	8	20.0
Very	3	42.9	1	20.0	3	50.0	1	8.3	13	32.5
Fathers										
Not at all	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.7	2	6.5	4	30.7
Not very	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	1	7.7
Moderately	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	2	15.4
Very	2	5.9	0	0.0	4	13.3	0	0.0	6	46.1

*These percentages are based on the group complaining only.

Likes and Dislikes Concerning Participation in Day Care. When asked about their likes concerning day care, seven (5.3%) of the mothers mentioned some activity which could be considered parent participation. Only three fathers (2.4%) listed parent participation as a specific like. When asked about dislikes, six mothers (4.5%) and four fathers (3.3%) mentioned something which could be categorized as parent participation.

Desired Participation. Parents were given the opportunity to talk about ways in which they would like to be involved at their child's center but were not. They were also able to say why they had not been able to participate as they wished.

Table 47 indicates the number of mothers in each group who wished to be further involved at their centers and on what level of participation. Seventy-five (56.8%) of all the day care mothers could think of at least one way they would like to be involved. Twenty-five percent of the entire group of mothers would have liked to participate at Level 4, i.e., work directly with the children as teacher aides, teachers, etc., although only 4.5% had any previous participation experience in this area. When questioned further, five mothers were able to think of a second way in which they would like to participate (Table 48) and two mothers found a third way (Table 49).

TABLE 47
DESIRED PARTICIPATION OF MOTHERS
FIRST CHOICE

Level	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	10	27.0	6	20.0	10	29.4	7	22.5	33	25.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.8	0	0.0	2	1.5
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	8	21.6	8	26.6	9	26.4	8	25.8	33	25.0
5	1	2.7	1	3.3	3	8.8	2	6.4	7	5.3
Total	19	51.3	15	50.0	24	70.5	17	54.8	75	56.8

*Levels coincide with the levels of involvement on Gordon's 5-point scale (see Page 27).

TABLE 48
DESIRED PARTICIPATION OF MOTHERS
SECOND CHOICE

Level	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0	0.0	1	3.3	1	2.9	0	0.0	2	1.5
4	0	0.0	1	3.3	1	2.9	1	3.2	3	2.2
Total	0	0.0	2	6.7	2	5.8	1	3.2	5	3.7

*Levels coincide with the levels of involvement on Gordon's 5-point scale (see Page 27).

TABLE 49
DESIRED PARTICIPATION OF MOTHERS
THIRD CHOICE

Level	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2	1	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.75
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	1	.75
Total	1	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	1.5

*Levels coincide with the levels of involvement on Gordon's 5-point scale (see Page 27).

Eighty-seven day care fathers (70.7%) could think of at least one way they would like to be involved at their child's center, and one father (.8%) had a second way. Table 50 indicates the number of fathers who wished to be further involved at their centers and on what level of participation. In the case of fathers it is notable that 14.6% desired to

participate at Level 4 although only .8% reported any such experience in the past.

TABLE 50
DESIRED PARTICIPATION OF FATHERS

Level	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	24	70.5	19	67.9	13	43.3	10	32.3	66	53.7
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	1	2.9	5	17.9	6	20.0	6	19.4	18	14.6
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.7	1	3.2	3	2.4
Total	25	73.4	24	85.8	21	70.0	17	54.9	87	70.7

*Levels coincide with the levels of involvement on Gordon's 5-point scale (see Page 27).

Hindrances to Participation. Mothers and fathers were further questioned as to what might be keeping them from participating as they would like. Table 51 indicates the number of mothers and fathers in each group who cited various hindrances.

A few of the findings for mothers should be pointed out. Thirty-four percent of all of the mothers had no time to participate further. This figure represents 60% of those who wished to participate. Perhaps more notable is the 22.7% of the total group, or 40% of those who wished to participate, felt that no opportunity had been offered them. A significantly higher number of urban rather than rural mothers felt that no opportunity had been offered them to participate although there was

no significant difference between the percentage of mothers in each group wishing to participate (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 51
HINDRANCES TO PARTICIPATION

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
No time	13	35.1	11	36.6	15	44.1	6	19.3	45	34.0
No training	0	0.0	2	6.6	1	2.9	4	12.9	7	5.3
Too tired	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.7	1	3.2	5	3.7
Not needed	2	5.4	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	3.2	4	3.0
No transportation	0	0.0	2	6.6	1	2.9	0	0.0	3	2.3
No babysitter	2	5.4	5	16.6	1	2.9	4	12.9	12	9.1
No opportunity	7	18.9	3	10.0	9	26.5	11	35.4	30	22.7
Fathers										
No time	15	44.1	19	67.9	11	36.7	10	32.2	55	44.7
No training	1	2.9	1	3.6	1	3.3	2	6.5	5	4.1
Too tired	0	0.0	1	3.6	3	10.0	1	3.2	5	4.1
Not needed	8	23.5	2	7.1	2	6.7	3	9.7	15	12.2
No transportation	0	0.0	1	3.6	1	3.3	0	0.0	2	1.6
No babysitter	0	0.0	2	7.1	2	6.7	1	3.2	5	4.1
No opportunity	11	32.4	5	17.9	11	36.7	5	16.1	32	26.0

Fathers also proved to have some interesting results. Almost 45% of the total group and 63.2% of those who wished to participate had no

time. About 12% of all the fathers, or 17.2% of those wishing to participate, did not think they were needed, and another 26.0% of the total group, or 36.8% of those wishing to participate, felt there was no opportunity to do so. A significantly higher percentage of rural rather than urban fathers wished additional participation (.05 level of significance). A significantly higher percentage of rural rather than urban fathers felt they were not needed at the center (.05 level of significance). A significantly higher percentage of private rural fathers rather than Title IV-A rural fathers did not feel needed (.05 level of significance). A significantly higher percentage of private fathers than Title IV-A fathers felt that no opportunity had been offered them to participate (.05 level of significance).

The fact that private fathers felt a significant lack of opportunity to participate is surprising in light of the previous findings that private urban fathers often show the highest amount of participation in some areas. Twenty percent of these fathers, however, wished to participate in activities at Level 4, i.e., as teacher or teacher aide or work directly with children, while only 3% of them had had this experience.

Overall Index of Parent Participation

An overall index of parent participation was constructed for mothers and fathers. This index incorporates two dimensions of participation. The first dimension considers levels of participation according to Gordon's scale (see Page 27). The second dimension deals with the frequency of the participation activity. The final index number is a combination of 13 groups of weighted activities multiplied by the frequency of those activities. This index is an attempt to have some overall measure of

parent participation. The scores have been grouped in the following manner:

	<u>Index Number</u>
Low participation	0-5
Moderate	6-13
High	14 and above

This designation is made only relative to the range of scores for the group.

The distribution of mothers' and fathers' scores across type of center is presented in Table 52. For the 132 day care mothers the index numbers ranged from 0 to 67. The mean was 14.4. The 123 day care fathers who responded to these questions had index scores ranging from 0 to 78. Their mean score was 7.6. Fifty percent of the fathers had a score of 5 or lower. Mean scores for the parent participation index were also calculated (Table 53).

T-tests for the differences between means were calculated to evaluate differences between the groups of mothers in overall participation with the following results:

a. There was no significant difference between the means for the urban and rural group (.05 level of significance).

b. The Title IV-A group had a significantly higher mean than the private group (.05 level of significance).

c. The Title IV-A rural group had a significantly higher group mean than the private rural group (.05 level of significance).

d. There was no significant difference between the means for the Title IV-A and private urban groups (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 52
OVERALL INDEX OF PARENT PARTICIPATION

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mothers										
Low 0-5	24	64.8	4	13.3	10	29.4	9	29.0	47	35.6
Mod. 6-13	12	32.4	10	33.3	14	41.1	9	29.0	45	34.1
High 14 and above	1	2.7	16	53.3	10	29.4	13	41.9	40	30.3
Total	37		30		34		31		132	100.0
Fathers										
Low 0-5	24	70.6	13	46.4	8	26.7	17	54.8	62	50.4
Mod. 6-13	9	26.5	10	35.7	10	33.3	10	32.3	39	31.7
High 14 and above	1	2.9	5	17.9	12	40.0	4	12.9	22	17.9
Total	34		28		30		31		123	100.0

TABLE 53
MEAN PARTICIPATION SCORES

	Mothers	Fathers
Urban	15.98	9.91
Rural	12.50	5.40
Title IV-A	19.34	6.46
Private	9.52	8.73
Private rural	5.35	4.26
Title IV-A rural	21.18	6.79
Private urban	14.23	13.80
Title IV-A urban	17.68	6.16

T-tests for the difference between two means were computed to determine group differences in the overall participation of fathers. The results were the following:

- a. The urban group was found to have a significantly higher mean than the rural group (.05 level of significance).
- b. There was no significant difference found between the means of the Title IV-A and private groups (.05 level of significance).
- c. There was no significant difference between the means for the Title IV-A and private rural groups (.05 level of significance).
- d. The private urban group had a significantly higher mean than the Title IV-A urban group.

Possible Determinants of Parent Participation

Other determinants of parent participation besides type of center were investigated, such as employment status, race, socioeconomic status of the mother and father. In the case of mothers no significant differences were found in level of participation when socioeconomic status or employment status were the focus. When multiple regression equations were calculated with maternal participation in day care as the dependent variable (measured by the overall maternal participation index) and the race, employment status and socioeconomic status of the mother as independent variables, race of mother was found to have the greatest ability (.22 correlation coefficient) to predict the participation of the mothers. Black mothers had a significantly higher mean participation score than white mothers, with a T-value at the .05 level of significance. In the case of fathers, when paternal participation was made the dependent variable, no variable except type of center could predict participation.

Marital Satisfaction

An index of marital satisfaction was constructed for both mothers and fathers based on four questions designed to evaluate their level of marital satisfaction. Table 54 indicates the mean marital satisfaction scores for mothers according to their employment status and whether they were in the day care or waiting list group, and Table 55 provides the group marital satisfaction means for fathers.

TABLE 54
MARITAL SATISFACTION INDEX OF MOTHERS
Group Means

Waiting list	4.96
Waiting unemployed	4.95
Waiting employed	5.00
Day care	5.42
Day care unemployed	5.14
Day care employed	5.63

T-tests for the difference between two means were calculated to evaluate significant differences in marital satisfaction for mothers with the following results:

a. Day care mothers were found to have a significantly higher level of marital satisfaction than waiting list mothers (.05 level of significance).

b. Employed mothers were found to have a significantly higher level of marital satisfaction than unemployed mothers (.05 level of significance).

TABLE 55
MARITAL SATISFACTION INDEX OF FATHERS
Group Means

Waiting list	5.39
Waiting list wife not working	5.33
Waiting list wife working	5.57
Day care	5.55
Day care wife not working	5.35
Day care wife working	5.67

c. Unemployed mothers within the day care and waiting list groups were not found to have significantly different marital satisfaction scores (.05 level of significance).

d. Employed mothers within the day care group were found to have a significantly higher mean for marital satisfaction than employed mothers within the waiting list group (.05 level of significance).

e. There was no significant difference in marital satisfaction scores within the waiting list group between employed and unemployed mothers (.05 level of significance).

f. The day care employed mothers' group had a significantly higher mean for the marital satisfaction score than day care unemployed mothers (.05 level of satisfaction).

T-tests for the difference between two means were done to evaluate group differences in marital satisfaction for fathers in the same six situations as mothers, and no significant differences were found.

A further analysis was made relating marital satisfaction to day care and maternal employment by looking only at the single item in which

the interviewee assessed his own level of marital satisfaction (Tables 56 and 57). As in the comparison with the total index there was a significant relationship (.02 level) with the way mothers rated their marital satisfaction and their day care and employment status. Although the relationship for fathers was not at as high a significance level (.06), there appeared to be a trend in the case of fathers similar to the differences among mothers.

The effect of parent participation on marital relationship was also considered. In the case of mothers, when run in a linear regression, maternal participation appeared to have no power to predict marital satisfaction (correlation coefficient .004). In the case of fathers, paternal participation in day care had no ability to predict marital satisfaction.

TABLE 56
MOTHERS' ASSESSMENT OF MARITAL SATISFACTION

	Unemployed Waiting		Employed Waiting		Unemployed Day Care		Employed Day Care	
How satisfied	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.9	0	0.0
Not very	4	9.1	3	23.1	7	13.2	4	5.6
Fairly	27	61.4	6	46.2	29	54.7	26	36.1
Extremely	13	29.5	4	30.8	16	30.2	42	58.3

$\chi^2 = 19.4$
P = .02
N = 176

TABLE 57
FATHERS' ASSESSMENT OF MARITAL SATISFACTION

How satisfied	Waiting List, Wife Unemployed		Waiting, Wife Employed		Day Care Wife Unemployed		Day Care, Wife Employed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all	1	2.4	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	1.4
Not very	2	4.9	1	7.7	3	5.8	1	1.4
Fairly	23	56.1	6	46.2	30	57.7	24	34.3
Extremely	15	36.6	5	38.5	19	36.5	44	62.9

$\chi^2 = 16.3$
P = .06
N = 176

DISCUSSION

After obtaining a description of parent participation activities, the question might be asked of whether participation is proceeding in the manner recommended by state and federal regulations and expert opinions in the field. Much of the participation seems to have followed the pattern suggested in A Curriculum of Training for Parent Participation in Project Head Start (Child Study Association of America, Inc., 1967) in that activity was of a social nature, as evidenced by the indices for social and group membership activities of mothers and fathers. The suggested purposes of these activities however were not being realized, i.e., formation of task-oriented parent participation groups and additional forms of parent participation, except in the case of fund raising groups, which had comparatively high membership (19.6% of the mothers and 13.8% of the fathers).

Other emphases were not so prominent. For instance, the suggestions in

Parents as Partners in Department Programs for Children (HEW, 1968a) were not being followed. Few partners worked as volunteers at the center in any capacity that would involve them with the children and parents were not employed by their program to any great extent or given training or promotions. The direct type of involvement with the children stressed so heavily either on a volunteer or paid basis did not seem to have materialized. There was, however, a high frequency of families acknowledging contact with the centers in some of the more traditionally suggested ways, such as observation of children at the center, being contacted by the center to discuss their child, and receipt of information through newsletters and various meetings with center personnel.

Between Center Differences in Participation

Although between center differences did occur, in the case of social activities there appeared to be little difference between the mothers' or fathers' groups on the basis of the urban or rural nature or type of funding of centers. However, in the case of continuing group memberships, differences began to appear, and the greater frequency of participation of Title IV-A rural mothers and private urban fathers was notable. The prominence of Title IV-A rural mothers occurred again in volunteer activities, advisory board membership, and observation at center with staff explanation, while private urban fathers were prominent in the center initiation index and the advisory board membership index. The prominence of Title IV-A rural mothers and private urban fathers was also quite notable in the scores for the amount and type of cited participation and in the overall participation index for mothers and fathers. There were individual cases in which other center types had higher frequencies

for certain types of participation, but the frequency of Title IV-A rural participation for mothers and private urban fathers is quite striking. No other such group differences are so discernable, except for ethnic group among mothers and socioeconomic status and income group among fathers.

It is not possible at this point to explain fully the reason for the Title IV-A rural mothers and private urban fathers participation, but, since the actual behavior of the center towards parents has not yet been related to their participation, it is quite possible that the approach different centers are taking toward parent participation is having an effect on actual levels of participation.

Mother vs. Father Differences in Participation

Although no formal analysis has been attempted of the differences between mothers and fathers, the higher frequency of maternal participation over parental participation is clear in all areas. Not only were mothers more involved in actual participation but the greater percentage of mothers reported that centers contacted them for varying reasons.

Degree of Parents' Participation

When considering the extent of parent participation within day care, perhaps one of the most striking findings is that 47.0% of the day care mothers and 78.0% of the day care fathers could not recall any personal activity which they would call parent participation during the 6 months prior to the interview. When the definition of parent participation was expanded by the interviewer to include any possible contact with the center, including that as minimal as acknowledging receipt of a newsletter, 35.6% of the day care mothers and 50.4% of the day care fathers

were able to attain index scores between 1-5, reflecting some minimal amount of participation, and only 5.3% of the mothers and 9.0% of the fathers still had scores of 0, reflecting no participation activity.

The level of participation was also a disappointing factor. The overall group results did not show "active" participation. Almost 76% of the day care mothers' activities and 79.5% of the day care fathers' activities were at Level 1 on Gordon's scale (see Page 27). They did not work directly with the children or make decisions concerning any aspect of day care very often. It is notable, however, that 15.1% of the mothers and 4.1% of the fathers claimed either past or present advisory board membership. (This activity is given the highest rating (5) for participation quality.)

Parents' Idea of Participation

It appears that some of the activities that researchers and program planners consider to be participation are not perceived by parents to be participation activities, particularly in the case of Level 3 activities. Although no mothers and no fathers cited Level 3 activities, 14.3% of the mothers and 8.9% of the fathers recalled, when questioned specifically, taking toys home from the center for use with their children, and 9.0% of the mothers and 5.0% of the fathers recalled taking home books for use with their children. Both of these activities would be classified as Level 3. When parents were questioned about desired participation, such home activities still did not come to mind. No mothers or fathers stated that they would have liked to participate in such a way. Level 2 activities involving parent education presents a similar problem. Almost no parents stated previous participation or a desire for future participation in

such a way. Yet these two activities, i.e., parent education and parent as teacher of his own child, are often stressed in the literature as important parent participation activities.

What Parents Do and Want

What the parents did and desired to do was very different. When parents were questioned about their present participation, they invariably reported Level 1 activities, even though when directly questioned they may have mentioned other activities. When parents were questioned concerning what participation they desired, a surprising percent of those who wished to participate further, 44.0% of the mothers and 20.6% of the fathers, wished to participate in Level 4 activities, i.e., as teachers, teacher aides, etc., involving direct work with the children at the center, and the remainder desired Level 1 activities.

It is unclear as to why so few parents participate in Level 4 activities and yet so many desire them. What is often stated by the literature as parent participation, i.e., parent education, taking home of materials, advisory board membership, do not seem to be recognized as parent participation or deemed to be desirable from the standpoint of the parents, even after having them brought to mind by the interviewers. They invariably say they are interested in activities belonging to Level 1 or 4.

We did interview the parent on what hindered their participation. In the case of both fathers and mothers "no time" was the reason most commonly stated, 60% of the mothers and 63% of the fathers who wished additional participation. Two other hindrances stated by mothers warrant

concern; feeling of no opportunity (40% of those wishing to participate) and no babysitter (16% of those wishing to participate). Aid with these two problems has been stressed continuously in the literature but seems to be still lacking as far as many mothers are concerned. In the case of fathers the feeling of no opportunity was again prominent (36% of those wishing to participate) and not feeling needed was another important concern (17% of those wishing to participate).

Day Care and the Marital Relationship

The combination of employment and day care appeared to play an important role in the marital satisfaction of mothers in this study. The factors of employment or day care, when considered separately did not show the same relationship. The same combination of maternal employment and day care seemed to be important to the husband too, but to a lesser degree.

When interviewees were asked to rate their marital satisfaction, employed waiting list wives and husbands of employed waiting list wives actually gave lower ratings (not significant) than unemployed ones. One might conjecture that day care rather than other forms of child care allows the employed mother to obtain increased satisfaction from her work, or increased income, which is then reflected in her marital relationship. This finding may be quite an important one. Literature on maternal employment considers many factors related to maternal employment and marital satisfaction, e.g., number of children, ages of children, socioeconomic status, income, ethnic group of family, feelings of husband

about wife working, feelings of wife about working, reason for wife working (choice vs. financial need). However, insufficient data has been obtained on the influence of the type and adequacy (satisfaction with) of child care for preschool children on maternal employment and marital satisfaction. The findings of this study suggest that this area warrants further investigation.

No parent participation in day care, other than sending the child to the center, had a relationship to marital satisfaction.

Further Study of Present Data

Many questions should still be investigated using present data, including the following:

- a. What is the relationship between actual parent participation and the communication reported by parents from their centers?
- b. What is the cause of the low number of fathers who participate? Are the centers providing avenues for them to participate?
- c. What is the relationship between those parents who wish to participate further and those who are now participating?
- d. What is the relationship between the level of participation of parents and complaints concerning the center?
- e. What is the relationship between the level of participation of the mother and father in each family?
- f. Although no direct relationship has been determined between participation and marital satisfaction, the data must be investigated further to consider cases in which fathers' and mothers' participation is considered jointly, i.e., is there a relationship when both are high, medium, or low participants or when their participation differed?

Further study might also be done using other available data.

Possible investigation could concern:

a. A comparison of the level of participation, desire for participation and perceived hindrances to participation by parents with data which has been obtained by The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Survey Questionnaire and Observation Reports (1972) on what activities their center had to offer and how satisfied center administrators felt with parent participation.

b. A comparison of scores of waiting list and day care populations to scores from larger more diversified populations to determine whether they are in fact a special group as far as marital satisfaction is concerned, perhaps due to their motivation for maternal employment and day care, or whether in fact they are quite similar to the general population. Data is available for other populations on the marital satisfaction index. Although certain relationships have been perceived between the day care and waiting list populations studied, it must be recognized that both of these groups have a common motivation for the use of day care, one group already using such services and one group awaiting the use of these services.

SUMMARY

The following is a list of the significant findings concerning parent participation and the relationship between the utilization of day care services and the husband-wife relationship:

a. Amount of actual participation.

1. The Title IV-A rural mothers' group mean was significantly greater than the private rural mothers' group mean (.05 level of significance).

2. The private urban fathers' group was found to have a significantly higher group mean than the Title IV-A urban fathers' group (.05 level of significance).

b. Level of activity.

1. The Title IV-A mothers had a significantly higher mean than the private mothers' group (.05 level of significance).

2. The Title IV-A rural mothers had a significantly higher mean than the private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

3. Private urban fathers had a significantly higher mean than Title IV-A urban fathers (.05 level of significance).

c. Group membership scores.

1. The Title IV-A mothers had a significantly higher mean than the private mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. The Title IV-A rural mothers had a significantly higher mean than the private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

d. Volunteer activities.

1. The Title IV-A rural mothers' group was found to have a significantly higher mean than the private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. The Title IV-A rural fathers had a significantly higher mean than the private rural fathers (.05 level of significance).

e. Center initiation scores.

1. The private urban group of fathers had a significantly higher mean than the Title IV-A urban fathers (.05 level of significance).

f. Advisory board membership.

1. There was a significantly higher percentage of Title IV-A rural mothers belonging than private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. There was a significantly higher percentage of private urban fathers belonging than Title IV-A urban fathers (.05 level of significance).

g. Receipt of toys.

1. A significantly greater percentage of private urban mothers received toys for home use than Title IV-A urban mothers (.05 level of significance).

h. Observation of children.

1. A significantly higher percentage of urban fathers observed than rural fathers (.05 level of significance).

2. A significantly higher percentage of private fathers observed than Title IV-A fathers (.05 level of significance).

3. A significantly higher percentage of private rural fathers observed than Title IV-A rural fathers (.05 level of significance).

1. Observation of children with staff explanation.

1. A significantly higher percentage of Title IV-A mothers observed with staff explanation than private mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. A significantly higher percentage of Title IV-A rural mothers observed with explanation than private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

j. Contacted by center.

1. A significantly higher percentage of Title IV-A mothers were contacted than private mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. A significantly higher percentage of Title IV-A rural mothers were contacted than private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

3. A significantly higher percentage of Title IV-A urban mothers were contacted than private urban mothers (.05 level of significance).

4. A significantly higher percentage of urban fathers were contacted than rural fathers (.05 level of significance).

k. Communication scores.

1. The Title IV-A mothers' mean was significantly higher than the private mothers' mean (.05 level of significance).

2. The Title IV-A rural mothers' mean was significantly higher than the private rural mothers' mean (.05 level of significance).

3. The Title IV-A urban mothers' mean was significantly higher than the private urban mothers' mean (.05 level of significance).

4. The Title IV-A fathers' group mean was significantly greater than the private fathers' group mean (.05 level of significance).

5. The urban fathers' group mean was significantly greater than the rural fathers' group mean (.05 level of significance).

6. The Title IV-A rural fathers' group mean was significantly greater than the private rural fathers' group mean (.05 level of significance).

l. Complaints about center.

1. A significantly greater number of urban than rural mothers had complaints (.05 level of significance).

m. Voiced complaints.

1. A significantly greater number of urban than rural mothers voiced complaints to their centers (.05 level of significance).

2. A significantly greater number of urban than rural fathers voiced complaints to their centers (.05 level of significance).

n. Hindrances to participation.

1. A significantly higher percentage of urban than rural mothers felt that no opportunity had been offered them to participate (.05 level of significance).

2. A significantly higher number of rural over urban fathers did not feel needed at their center (.05 level of significance).

3. A significantly greater percentage of private than Title IV-A fathers felt that no opportunity had been offered them to participate (.05 level of significance).

o. Overall participation.

1. The Title IV-A mothers had a significantly greater mean score than the private mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. The Title IV-A rural mothers had a significantly higher mean than the private rural mothers (.05 level of significance).

3. The urban fathers had a significantly higher mean than the rural fathers (.05 level of significance).

4. The private urban fathers had a significantly higher mean than the Title IV-A urban fathers (.05 level of significance).

5. The black mothers had a significantly higher score than the white mothers (.05 level of significance).

p. Marital satisfaction index.

1. Day care mothers were found to have a significantly higher level of marital satisfaction than waiting list mothers (.05 level of significance).

2. Employed mothers had a significantly higher level of marital satisfaction than unemployed mothers (.05 level of significance).

3. Employed mothers within the day care group were found to have significantly higher mean marital satisfaction than the employed mothers within the waiting list group (.05 level of significance).

4. The day care employed mothers had a significantly higher mean marital satisfaction score than the day care unemployed group (.05 level of significance).

q. Single rating of marital satisfaction.

1. There was a significant relationship between the way mothers rated their marital satisfaction and their day care and employment status (.05 level of significance).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Axelson, L. Marital adjustment and marital role definitions of husbands of working and non-working wives. Marriage and Family Living, 1963, 25 (2), 189-195.
- Blood, R. O. Marriage. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- Blood, R. O., & Hamblin, R. L. The effects of the wife's employment on the family power structure. In N. W. Bell & E. F. Vogel (Eds.) A modern introduction to the family, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.
- Cahn, J. C., & Cahn, E. S. Citizen participation. In H. B. C. Spiegel (Ed.), Citizen participation in urban development. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories Institute of Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.
- Child Study Association of America, Inc. A curriculum of training for parent participation in Project Head Start. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Chilman, C. S. Growing up poor. (Welfare Administration Publication No. 13). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Cloward, R. A., & Jones, J. A. Social class: Educational attitudes and participation. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1963.
- Donovan, J. C. The politics of poverty. New York: Pegasus, 1967.
- Dymond, R. Interpersonal perception and marital happiness. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1954, 3, 164-171.
- Egland, G. O. Parents in Head Start programs. Young Children, 1966, May, 293-296.
- Federal interagency day care requirements. (U. S. Code, Title 45 - Subtitle A - Part 71) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Fried, M. A study of demographic and social determinants of functional achievement in a negro population. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1971a, in press.
- Fried, M. The world of the working class. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1971b, in press.

- Goode, W. J. Marital satisfaction and instability across cultural class analyses of divorce rates. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 4, 507-526.
- Gordon, J. Developing parent power. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Critical issues in research related to disadvantaged children, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
- Gover, D. A. Socioeconomic differential in the relationship between marital adjustment and wife's employment status. Marriage and Family Living, 1963, November, 452-458.
- Green, R., Hollick, R., Knowles, K., Van der Kar, C., & Winter, M. The Pennsylvania day care study survey questionnaire and observation reports, (Technical Report No. 9). University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, 1972.
- Gross, N., McEachern, A. W., & Mason, W. S. Role conflict and its resolution. In B. Biddle, & E. Thomas (Eds.), Role theory: Concepts and research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Grotberg, E. (Ed.). Day care: Resources for decisions. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Hicks, M. W., & Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32 (3), 553-575.
- Hoffman, D. Telephone conversation, 1971.
- Hoffman, L. W. Parental power relations and the division of household tasks. In I. F. Nye, & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), The employed mother in America. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1963.
- Hurvitz, N. The marital roles inventory and the measurement of marital adjustment. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1970, 16, 377-380.
- Kagan, J., & Whitten, P. Day care can be dangerous. Psychology Today, 1970, December, 36-39.
- Kelly, E. L. Marital comparability as related to personality traits of husbands and wives, as rated by self and spouse. Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 193-198.
- Kirschner Associates, Inc. A national survey of the impacts of Head Start centers on community institutions. (HE 21.202: In 7) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Komaravsky, M. Blue collar marriage. New York, N. Y.: Random House, 1964.

- Larrabee, M. M. Involving parents in their children's day care experiences. Children, 1969, August, 153.
- Lazar, I., & Rosenberg, M. In E. Grotberg (Ed.), Day care: Resources for decisions. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.
- Lowry, R. P. Power to the people - Political evolution or revolution? The Urban Social Change Review, 1970, Spring, 2.
- Morgan, G. Twenty-three prejudices which hurt three million American children. Unpublished paper, 1968.
- Murstein, B. J., & Glaudin, V. The relationship of marital adjustment to personality: A factor analysis of the interpersonal check list. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 37-43.
- Myers, L., Elliott, V., Harrell, J., & Hostetter, M. J. The family and community day care interview (Technical Report No. 6). University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, 1972.
- New York University Law Review. Win program, Notes, 1969, October, 798.
- Nye, I. F. Maternal employment and marital interaction: Some contingent conditions. Social Forces, 1961, 40 (2), 113-119.
- Nye, I. F., & MacDougall, F. The dependent variable in marital research. Pacific Sociological Review, 1969, Fall, 7-70.
- Office of Family Services. Title 4600 regulations - Child day care centers under social service auspices. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, 1969.
- Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. M. Working wives and marriage happiness. The American Journal of Sociology, 1962, 392-407.
- Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. M. Dimensions of marriage happiness. The American Journal of Sociology, 1969, 74 (4), 392-407.
- Peters, D. L., & Stein, N. L. Project Head Start - Summer, 1966: An evaluational report. San Mateo, Calif.: San Mateo Human Resources Commission, 1966.
- Riesman, F. The new anti-poverty ideology. Paper presented at the White House Conference on Civil Rights, Washington, D. C., 1966.

- Rothschild, S. C. The study of family power structure: A review, 1960-1969. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 539-552.
- Ruderman, F. A. Conceptualizing needs for day care: Some conclusions drawn from the child welfare league day care project. Child Welfare, 1965, April, 212.
- Schaefer, E. S. Need for early continuing education. In V. Denninberg (Ed.), Education of the infant and young child. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Siegel, A. (Ed.). Research issues related to the effects of maternal employment on children. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, Social Science Research Center, June, 1961.
- Spiegel, H. (Ed.). Citizen participation in urban development. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.
- Spiegel, H. (Ed.). Citizen participation in urban development. Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Regulations and Advice, 1968.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Parents as partners in department programs for children and youth. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, August, 1968a.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Prelude to school. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968b.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Day care: Administration. (HE 21.11:7) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, 1970a.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Day care: Staff training. (HE 21.11:5) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, 1970b.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Day care: A statement of principles. (HE 21.11:1) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, 1970c.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Model programs, childhood education, Springfield Avenue Community School. (HE 220: 20157) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, National Center for Educational Communication, 1970d.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and U. S. Department of Labor. Child care arrangements of working mothers in the United States. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

- U. S. Department of Labor - Wage and Labor Standards Administration. Working mothers and the need for child care services. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June, 1968.
- U. S. Department of Labor - Wage and Labor Standards Administration. Federal funds for day care projects. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, February, 1969.
- U. S. Office of Child Development. Head Start development programs. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, September, 1967.
- U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Head Start 6, parents are needed. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966a.
- U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start - Summer 1966 - An evaluation report. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966b.
- U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start, Points for parents, 10. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, November, 1967.
- U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start parent involvement 10A. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June 1969a.
- U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Review of research 1965 to 1969. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969b.
- Westinghouse Learning Corporation. The impact of Project Head Start: An evaluation of the effects of Head Start on children's cognitive and affective development. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University, June, 1969.
- Wolfe, H. H. (Ed.). Women in the world of work. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Division of Research, 1969.

THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE PARENT
PARTICIPATION ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Center for Human Services Development
College of Human Development
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pa. 16802

THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE PARENT
PARTICIPATION ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT¹

Lu V. Keiter

The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

This project studied the relationship between day care participation, type of funding (Social Security Act Title IV-A or private), and community awareness and involvement in rural and urban Pennsylvania. Only in the rural areas did day care participation become an element of community participation. There was no direct relationship between day care and community participation. The socioeconomic status of fathers best predicted their participation in community activities, while education was the best predictor for mothers and the urban setting was their most advantageous location for a high level of participation. The fathers from private centers were the most involved in the community and held the most powerful position in the centers. Urban mothers were the most involved in the community; however, the Title IV-A mothers were the most open to increased participation after their children entered day care programs. Title IV-A mothers were involved in more decision-making roles in their centers.

¹This report was prepared under contract with the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. The opinions and recommendations expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the sponsoring agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
ABSTRACT.....	118
INTRODUCTION.....	122
Review of Literature.....	123
METHODS.....	131
Sample Design.....	132
Sample Characteristics.....	132
RESULTS.....	133
Community Activities Participation.....	133
Fathers.....	136
Mothers.....	144
Community Power Structure.....	153
Parent Participation and Community Outreach.....	162
DISCUSSION.....	171
Fathers.....	171
Mothers.....	173
Suggestions for Future Studies.....	175
SUMMARY.....	176
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	179

TABLES

Table 1	Socialization.....	127
Table 2	Distribution of Sample According to Enrollment and Geographical Area.....	132
Table 3	Community Activities Cited by Parents and the Value of Each.....	135
Table 4	Community Activities Index for the Four Main Classifications of Before Day Care and Waiting List Fathers.....	136
Table 5	Community Activities Index of Before Day Care and Waiting List Fathers According to Type of Funding and Location of Center.....	137
Table 6	Mean Scores for the Community Activities of Before Day Care and Waiting List Fathers.....	138

Topic	Page
Table 7 Mean Scores of Day Care Fathers for SES, Annual Income, and Community Activities Before Day Care.....	138
Table 8 Community Activities Index for the Four Main Classifications of Day Care Fathers After Participation.....	140
Table 9 Community Activities Index of the Day Care Fathers After Participation According to Type of Funding and Location of Center.....	140
Table 10 Mean Scores for the Community Activities of the Waiting List, Before Day Care and After Day Care Fathers.....	142
Table 11 Change Occurring in Community Activities of Day Care Fathers.....	143
Table 12 Relationship Between the SES and Community Activities of Fathers.....	144
Table 13 Community Activities Index for the Four Main Classifications of Before Day Care and Waiting List Mothers.....	145
Table 14 Community Activities Index of Before Day Care and Waiting List Mothers According to Type of Funding and Location of Center.....	146
Table 15 Mean Scores for the Community Activities of Before Day Care and Waiting List Mothers.....	147
Table 16 Community Activities Index of the Day Care Mothers After Participation According to the Four Main Groups...	148
Table 17 Community Activities Index of the Day Care Mothers After Participation According to Type of Funding and Location of Center.....	149
Table 18 Mean Scores for the Community Activities of the Waiting List, Before Day Care and After Day Care Mothers.....	150
Table 19 Change Occurring in Community Activities of Day Care Mothers.....	151
Table 20 Employment Classification and Mean Community Activities Score of the Day Care Mothers.....	152
Table 21 Relationship Between the SES and Community Activities of Day Care Mothers After Participation.....	153
Table 22 Sample's Responses Concerning Groups Supporting Day Care Services.....	154

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 23 Sample's Responses Concerning Groups Not Supporting Day Care Services.....	155
Table 24 Sample's Responses Concerning Individuals Favoring Day Care Services.....	155
Table 25 Sample's Responses Concerning Individuals Not Favoring Day Care Services.....	156
Table 26 Sample's Responses on the Attitude of the Church Toward Day Care.....	158
Table 27 Sample's Responses on the Attitude of Community Organizations Toward Day Care.....	159
Table 28 Sample's Responses on the Attitude of Local Government Toward Day Care.....	160
Table 29 Sample Not Responding to Questions on the Church, Community Organizations, and Local Government.....	161
Table 30 Significance of the Number of Nonrespondents.....	162
Table 31 Number of Fathers and Mothers Receiving Parent Education.....	163
Table 32 Sample Receiving Parent Education.....	164
Table 33 Advisory Board Participation of Fathers and Mothers.....	165
Table 34 Volunteer or Paid Positions Held by Fathers.....	166
Table 35 Volunteer or Paid Positions Held by Mothers.....	167
Table 36 Services Received by Fathers and Mothers at Centers.....	169
Table 37 Fathers and Mothers Referred to Services in Community...	170
Table 38 Sample Receiving Social Services.....	171

THE EFFECTS OF DAY CARE PARENT
PARTICIPATION ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Lu V. Keiter

The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

Since great importance is placed on the participation of parents in day care, it is time the effects of such participation were weighed, particularly as they relate to parents in the context of their community. Robert Parker in A Statement of Principles - Day Care U. S. A. (1970) has said that "in view of the critical role of parents in the child's development, an effective day care program must create every opportunity for enhancing interaction with children both in the day care setting and at home [p. 8]."

From the view expressed in the literature (Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), 1967, p. 2; Costello & Binstock, 1970, p. 3), day care should provide the parent with, among other things, the opportunity to gain more self-confidence. Hopefully this greater self-assurance will lead to a greater participation of the entire family in neighborhood and community affairs. The family should become more knowledgeable about community resources and opportunities and, what is more important, should seek out these resources and opportunities for themselves. Finally, day care participation should give families the opportunity to discuss family, community, and personal problems and offer some possibilities for solving these problems. Members of the family should become "participating, responsible, and active members of the community [Costello & Binstock, 1970, p. 3]."

The purpose of this study was to assess the effect of day care participation on parents in relationship to their participation in the community, their knowledge of the community and its power structure, and their utilization of such community resources as mental and physical health facilities.

Review of Literature

Government literature, particularly that dealing with Project Head Start, sees day care involvement and increased community participation in a cause-and-effect relationship. The sequence has four steps: (a) recruitment of parents, (b) informal participation, (c) formal participation, (d) community involvement. The benefits accrued at each level are described briefly in the following:

(1) Recruitment

- a. Parents are ensured of their eligibility
- b. Parents are informed about their role in the program
- c. Parents' interests, talents and needs are identified
- d. Parent participation is encouraged
- e. The community is interested and involved in the program

(2) Informal participation through informal socials, coffee hours, recreational and educational activities, and family picnics

- a. Parents get to know the staff
- b. Parents get to know each other and identify the leaders in their group
- c. Parents learn more about the Head Start program, their role and responsibilities
- d. Parents identify the kind of parent programs that interest them

- (3) Formal participation through group committees, central advisory committees, training sessions, working at centers, and educational workshops
 - a. Parents gain a deeper understanding about the program and their parental role, and responsibilities
 - b. Parents enrich the children's program
 - c. Parents broaden their knowledge of community services, community leaders, services needed and community problems
 - d. Develop skills and leadership
- (4) Involvement in the community through serving on policy advisory committees, developing self-help programs, utilizing existing community resources, participating in community sponsored activities, becoming members of governing boards of other community agencies, and obtaining needed services
 - a. Parents develop a more positive self-image and leadership skills
 - b. Parents function independently and as members of a group
 - c. Parents understand how organizations work
 - d. Parents gain skills that will assist them to change the conditions that made them and their children eligible to participate in the Head Start program [OEO, 1969, pp. 7-8].

In order for the cause-and-effect process to work, parent education courses and informal gatherings must prove successful. Much has been written on the participation of various income groups in these activities.

Allen (1968, pp. 108-109) studied the differences in family activities and the degree of participation in social organization between 119 Head Start families and 114 private preschool children. Head Start mothers were more active and Head Start fathers less active than the private preschool parents.

In general, it appears that the Head Start mothers are highly active in parent-teacher associations, community action programs, parent groups, mothers' groups, and church groups. The private preschool mothers seem to be active in the parent-teachers associations, recreation groups, and church groups...The private preschool mothers added many more activities to the structured list, indicating greater diversification and emphasizing interest in different types of activity [p. 109].

The difference in types of activities sought out by middle-class and nonmiddle-class individuals (class difference is essentially what determines participation in a private or public day care center) was emphasized strongly by Kraft and Chilman (1966). They saw the efforts of parent participation activities as most probably failing among lower income individuals because, in order for the education process to succeed, the individual must be aspiring for upward mobility, a distinctly middle-class aspiration.

We can surmise that the minority of low-income adults who do not adhere to this pattern of civic apathy possess certain psychological and social characteristics which distinguish them from the majority of low-income groups, and that these characteristics enable them to accept a mode of action which is more typical of middle-income segments of the population... Civic associations, educational courses, workshops, and the prevailing social groupings are almost invariably directed toward some social or self-improvement aim. Such associations and educational efforts will perhaps prove attractive to the upwardly aspiring individual who is interested in personal uplift and improvement [p. 30].

Kitano (1969) would disagree that lower income individuals are not interested in education and self-improvement, rather he said they are unable to act as a result of "those feelings of alienation and powerlessness which characterize the disadvantaged [p. 12]."

Chandler (1966), in his study of 40 Head Start and 40 culturally disadvantaged families in Rochester, New York, looked at the socialization differences between Head Start and non-Head Start families. Both groups lived within the same geographical area, the negro ghetto, and both fell into the category of poverty families. The factor of participation in a Head Start program was the independent variable. The group life of the Head Start families was somewhat greater than that of non-Head Start families (Table 1), but both groups participated less in those activities which were more closely related to formal institutions.

Chandler stated:

This again reflects the failure of formal institutions as influential forces in the lives of these groups (culturally disadvantaged). There is a correlation in the attitudes and participation of Head Start families in the areas of attitudes toward, and participation in, the institutional forces and structures of the community. Head Start families show a consistently greater participation in membership in the church, lodge, school, church and settlement house programs...and a more positive attitude toward police, and the church as a source of help and an active agent in the civil rights struggle, than did non-Head Start families...Cultural deprivation may be related to non-involvement in, and negative attitudes toward, the institutional forces of the community ...[p. 82].

Thompson (1970) examined the participation of parents in local government and school affairs when those conditions which traditionally favor or disfavor participation were altered. The sample included people from six communities in Oregon (one a subarea of Portland, the black section), ranging in size from 2,000 to 350,000 and having three income groups: (a) \$1,000-3,999, (b) 4,000-6,999, (c) 7,000-up. Involvement in government and school affairs was usually attributed to the socioeconomic

TABLE 1
SOCIALIZATION

Yes Responses only as a
% of total interviews
(Chandler, 1966, p. 57)

Head Start		Non-Head Start
82.1%	Church member	71.4%
75.0%	Knows pastor	51.4%
17.9%	Lodge member	14.2%
3.6%	Other organizations	2.8%
75.0%	Movies	68.6%
32.1%	Bar	31.4%
14.3%	Pool room	14.2%
96.4%	Visit friends	77.1%
25.0%	Dances	37.1%
10.7%	Settlement house program	14.2%
46.4%	School	34.3%
46.4%	Church	42.9%
67.9%	Votes primary	42.9%
78.6%	Votes regular	57.1%
42.9%	Ward club member	11.4%
60.7%	Knows supervisor	37.1%
32.1%	Knows council	25.7%

status (SES), education, and age of the individual (did he have children of school age). These conditions implied that, as an individual climbs up the SES scale, the quality and quantity of his community participation increases.

This differentiation of behavior is explained in terms of greater responsibilities to, and awareness of, the neighborhood and urban area as a whole, which thereby produces (or at least implies) greater need or desire or realization that participation in the various activities of government and the educational institutions is to his, and others benefit [p. 3].

The position of the Head Start rationale is that, while it cannot implicitly change an individual's SES, it can, by instilling new values and responsibilities through parent education, create an aspiration within the individual for what are essentially the middle-class goals of community participation, more education, better health care facilities, a better way of life. As Thompson saw it:

The implications of any system of categorization are that the categories themselves somehow attract or define the elements (in this case defining people) within them. If, therefore, one of those elements acquires the characteristics of another category, [in this case the social and political awareness of the middle class] and is accordingly shifted, the assumption is that secondary attributes (in this case their interests) found within the new category will develop forthwith [p. 20].

The variables Thompson tested were changes in SES, home ownership, marital status, age, membership in PTA, and membership in civic organizations. He reported:

Changes in income (over two years) had no predictable effect upon the amount of interest generated in the general population by local government or the school system. While there was, almost without exception, more interest change per group among those who experienced some change of income, the direction of that change in interest level could not be said to be a function of the income change.

With regard to joining new community organizations, there was no predictable effect upon a person's interest in the school system or government since a decrease in membership was just as likely as joining extra organizations to result in a negative change in interest, or vice versa. This was the case regardless of the size or type of community the individual lived in.

PTA membership had no effect on the individual's interest in the school system or local government. It appeared that across the total sample, regardless of the organization membership, or the type size of the urban area lived in, there was a general decline of interest in the school system.

The relationship between changes in interest in local politics and city government, and change in interest in the school system is an almost perfect linear one.

In the case of the school system there appears to be a slight linear relationship between interest change and activity, i.e., as interest wanes so also does activity in the area. The case for interest in city government, etc., is not so clear and does not allow any inferences. It is highly likely here that activity is strongly related to interest change over issues, rather than a long-term continuing phenomenon.

In the black sample, of the few who did serve a civil rights organization during that time there was no change in interest, either positive or negative [pp. 15-26].

Thompson concluded that "there are two types of people, those who are interested and active in public works generally and were involved fairly consistently, and those who, if they get aroused...tend to last out an issue and then disappear again [pp. 28-29]."

The Kirschner Associates' report, A National Survey of the Impacts of Head Start Centers on Community Institutions (1970), was designed to determine the following:

...if community health and educational institutions had changed in specific ways relevant to Head Start. To make this determination, field research was undertaken in a national sample composed of 58 communities with full-year Head Start programs. The final phase of the field work was conducted in 42 of the original 58 communities. In these 42 communities, a total of 47 specific changes in health and educational institutions were studied intensively. These investigations were to determine how Head Start had been involved in bringing about these changes. Systematic field investigations were also conducted in seven communities with little or no exposure to Head Start and the results were compared with similar communities that had had more extensive Head Start experiences [p. 3].

Of the study's results, the following relate to this study:

All of the respondents reported one or more incidents of community change that they felt were directly or indirectly attributable to Head Start. Direct impacts were reported most consistently in elementary schools and in health institutions, with some changes also reported in other institutions...

The types of changes mentioned most frequently with respect to educational institutions included trends toward decentralization, increased use of indigenous neighborhood residents in paraprofessional positions, modifications of curricula to make them more sensitive to minority group cultures and history, modifications of curricula derived from Head Start experiences, improved facilities, and decreases in student-teacher ratios...

In the health areas reports indicated that Head Start families had begun increasingly to seek out and demand more health care because they had learned the location of facilities, the types of services available, and the value of such services. This placed severe pressure on health facilities and often caused authorities to modify delivery systems to improve service...

A study of impacts in a limited sample of communities without Head Start programs revealed that, for a number of reasons, little effective work was being done in any of them to bring about meaningful change in the lives of their poor residents...Perhaps more significant was a failure in some communities to use available funds in ways beneficial to the poor...

Head Start was highly involved in approximately 56% of the changes studied when the level of parent participation was also high. Head Start was highly involved in the change process in only 26% of the cases when the level of parent participation was low...

When parent participation was high, Head Start also participated substantially (in 56% of the changes) as "idea proposer," or initiator of change, whereas this function was only infrequently performed (in only 23% of the changes) by Head Start centers with low parent participation...

It would seem that when Head Start involved the poor (the parents) in its organizational structure, this structure in turn had a tendency to become a vehicle through which Head Start contributed to the background for change...

However, the level of participation by parents in the Head Start program was not related to Head Start's efforts in encouraging local private citizens to support the institutional changes. It was also determined that level of parent participation in Head Start had no bearing on whether modifications in Head Start centers were related to their involvement in external change processes [pp. 30-125].

METHODS

In order to obtain data for this study, an interview schedule was developed. Existing literature, observations and interviews at day care centers, and as adaptation of some existing interviews and questionnaires formed the basis for the schedule. It was used to interview a sample of families with children in day care and families with children awaiting enrollment in day care throughout Pennsylvania. For a fuller description of the origin and rationale of specific questions consult The Family and Community Day Care Interview, The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, Technical Report No. 6, June 1, 1972.

Sample Design

A sample of 132 2-parent, intact families were selected from 39 day care centers to represent urban-rural and Title IV-A-private² day care in Pennsylvania. As a control group, a sample of 58 2-parent, intact families awaiting day care services were selected to represent the same criteria as met by the day care families (Table 2). A cluster sampling representing the various socioeconomic levels and population densities in the state was drawn and assured by the geographical area chosen.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO
ENROLLMENT AND GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

	Rural		Urban	
	N	%	N	%
Waiting list	35	18.4	23	12.1
Title IV-A day care	30	15.7	31	16.3
Private day care	37	19.4	34	17.8

Sample Characteristics

Although the intent was to include only 2-parent families, the interviewers on several occasions arrived at homes for interviews to

²For the purpose of this study, the term Title IV-A designates those day care centers that receive at least 50% of their financial support from federal funds established by the 1967 amendments to the United States Social Security Act. The term private designates those day care centers that do not receive financial support from United States government sources.

find a couple separated (this change in status being recent and not known by the day care center when it completed its list of 2-parent families). Because of this unavoidable occurrence 184 2-parent families and six mothers of 1-parent families were interviewed. The six 1-parent families were excluded from the analysis when they conflicted with the theoretical issues being examined.

A characteristic which was not possible to include in the original design was the racial group of the families interviewed. Not enough was known about the population to include ethnicity as a criterion. The ethnic group of each family was recorded during the interview, however. The following distribution resulted: of the total sample 27.9% of the families were black, 70% were white, and 2% belonged to other racial groups. The percentage of blacks was significantly higher than the percentage of blacks across Pennsylvania, which is 8.6%. A closer inspection of the sample along the urban-rural dimension showed that only 3.1% of the families using day care in the rural areas were black, while 56.8% of those utilizing day care in the urban areas of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were black (26.4% and 16.7%, respectively, of their general populations is black). The proportions of urban blacks in private and Title IV-A day care were not equal. In private urban centers 29.5% of the families were black, and 66.6% of the sample from Title IV-A urban centers was black.

RESULTS

Community Activities Participation

A function of most day care programs is to involve parents in their child's education and to educate the parents to the influences in the

community which affect this education. This function is seen as so important that Title IV-A centers must provide involvement for parents.

The effects of this involvement, i.e., serving on day care boards and committees and increased involvement in community affairs, were measured directly by questioning the day care parents about their community participation both before and after their child entered day care and by asking the waiting list parents about their present participation. Both groups were asked to respond about their part in community activities. The day care sample was asked to reflect on its participation before it experienced day care and then to rate the participation in the same activities after day care began. Since 67% of the children had been attending a center for 1 year or less, the average time lapse the day care parents were asked to consider was about 1 year.

The activities were weighted with a value of 1 to 5 points, depending upon the amount of initiative each would require. A total "before day care" score for the day care parents and a score indicating the present involvement of the waiting list parents was computed. Table 3 indicates the activities cited and the weight placed on each. Each individual's score was classified as high (H), medium (M), low (L), or zero (0) based on a predetermined scale.

For the participation index after day care began, the activities which showed increased participation were rated one point higher (2-6); the activities which remained the same were weighted the same (1-5); those activities which showed decreased participation were weighted 0; new activities participated in only after day care began were weighted as on

the initial scale (1-5). This rating method favored increased participation; however, it lowered the scores of parents who still participated at a lower level and was unfair in this respect.

The use of this rating scale permitted the following to be compared: (a) the "before" and "after" scores of the day care sample, (b) the "before" scores of day care parents and the scores of the waiting list parents, and (c) the "after" scores of the day care sample and the scores of the waiting list sample. There was one handicap to this procedure that could not be compensated for: that of the time lag factor which was introduced into the scores of the day care parents.

TABLE 3
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES CITED BY PARENTS
AND THE VALUE OF EACH

Activities	Points
Serve on a day care advisory board or day care parent committee	5
Work actively with any community or civic group	4
Hold an office or serve on a committee in a community or civic group	5
Speak to community leaders about community problems	4
Speak to more than one other person in the community about community problems	3
Visit community or civic organizations or their meetings to find out about community problems	3
Try to inform yourself in other ways about community problems, for example, newspaper articles and TV or radio programs	1
Belong to one or more organizations that take stands on community issues and problems	2

Fathers. Tables 4 and 5 show the distribution of the community activities index (CAI) for the before day care fathers' group and the waiting list fathers' group. The high percent (64%) of 0 scores from the Title IV-A rural group is noteworthy since it necessarily lowered the mean score. Such a low score indicates either a lack of knowledge on the part of this sample group or lack of cooperation with the interviewers, since simply reading a newspaper would have rated the individual one point.

TABLE 4
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX FOR THE FOUR MAIN
CLASSIFICATIONS OF BEFORE DAY CARE
AND WAITING LIST FATHERS

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care fathers										
High	7	21	1	4	8	27	1	3	17	14
Medium	8	24	1	4	6	20	7	23	22	18
Low	12	35	8	29	9	30	14	45	53	43
0	7	21	18	64	7	23	9	29	41	33
Waiting list fathers										
High	0	0	2	7	1	17	2	13	5	9
Medium	2	67	6	20	1	17	2	13	11	20
Low	1	33	10	33	3	50	8	53	22	41
0	0	0	12	40	1	17	3	20	16	30

TABLE 5
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX OF BEFORE DAY CARE
AND WAITING LIST FATHERS ACCORDING TO
TYPE OF FUNDING AND LOCATION OF CENTER

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care fathers										
High	15	23	2	3	9	15	8	13	17	14
Medium	14	22	8	14	13	21	9	15	22	18
Low	21	33	22	37	23	38	20	32	53	43
0	14	22	27	46	16	26	25	40	41	33
Waiting list fathers										
High	1	11	4	9	3	14	2	6	5	9
Medium	3	33	8	18	3	14	8	24	11	20
Low	4	44	18	40	11	52	11	33	22	41
0	1	11	15	33	4	19	12	36	16	30

The mean scores for the community activities of each group of fathers were computed (Table 6). Those of the participation before day care for the day care sample followed the same order as their mean SES and mean annual income. Their rank in order from highest to lowest was private urban, private rural, Title IV-A urban, Title IV-A rural (see Table 7). The mean score of the waiting list sample fell into approximately the same pattern, but it was somewhat distorted by the small private rural waiting list group.

TABLE 6
MEAN SCORES FOR THE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES OF
BEFORE DAY CARE AND WAITING LIST FATHERS

	Before Day Care		Waiting List	
	N	Mean	N	Mean
Private rural	34	7.500	3	9.000
Title IV-A rural	28	1.750	30	4.267
Private urban	30	8.767	6	7.333
Title IV-A urban	31	4.226	15	4.933
Private	64	8.094	9	7.889
Title IV-A	52	3.051	45	4.489
Urban	61	6.459	21	5.619
Rural	62	4.903	33	4.697
Total	123	5.675	54	5.056

TABLE 7
MEAN SCORES OF DAY CARE FATHERS FOR SES, ANNUAL INCOME,
AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES BEFORE DAY CARE

Group	SES	Annual Income	Community Activities Before Day Care
Private urban	3.91	\$10,725	8.767
Private rural	3.56	8,869	7.500
Title IV-A urban	3.48	8,592	4.226
Title IV-A rural	2.80	6,864	1.750

T-tests for the differences between two means for community activities were computed to determine group differences for the before day care fathers, for the waiting list fathers, and between the before day care and waiting list fathers with the following results:

a. Before day care sample of fathers:

1. The private day care sample had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A day care group ($p < .05$).

2. There was no significant difference between the urban day care sample and the rural day care sample ($p < .05$).

3. The private urban day care group had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A urban day care sample and the Title IV-A rural day care sample ($p < .05$).

4. There was no significant difference between the private urban day care sample and the private rural day care sample ($p < .05$).

5. There was no significant difference between the Title IV-A urban day care sample and the Title IV-A rural sample ($p < .05$).

b. Waiting list sample of fathers:

1. There was no significant difference between any of the sample groups ($p < .05$).

c. Before day care vs. waiting list fathers:

1. The rural waiting list sample had a significantly higher mean than the Title IV-A rural day care sample; however, there was no significant difference between the Title IV-A rural before day care sample and the Title IV-A rural waiting list sample ($p < .05$). The difference was due to the elevated rural waiting list mean (elevated by the high private rural waiting list sample, where $N = 3$).

2. There were no other significant differences between any groups in the sample ($p < .05$).

Tables 8 and 9 indicate the after day care CAI of the day care men. A total of 61% of the Title IV-A rural men were still not involved in community activities. This percentage shows considerably more nonparticipants than the waiting list sample (40%).

TABLE 8
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX FOR THE FOUR MAIN CLASSIFICATIONS
OF DAY CARE FATHERS AFTER PARTICIPATION

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	6	18	1	4	6	20	2	6	15	12
Medium	10	29	2	7	7	23	5	16	24	20
Low	11	32	8	29	11	37	15	48	45	37
0	7	21	17	61	6	20	9	29	39	32

TABLE 9
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX OF THE DAY CARE
FATHERS AFTER PARTICIPATION ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF FUNDING AND LOCATION OF CENTER

	Private		Title IV-A		Urban		Rural		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	12	19	3	5	8	13	7	11	15	12
Medium	17	27	7	12	12	20	12	19	24	20
Low	22	34	23	39	26	43	19	31	45	37
0	13	20	26	44	15	24	24	39	39	32

For easier comparison, Table 10 shows the group means of the three divisions of fathers together. In all groups, the mean after day care was higher than the mean before day care; however, it was not necessarily higher than the mean score of the waiting list sample. The after day care scores were again in the same order as the SES and mean annual income. They ranked in the following order of highest to lowest: private urban, private rural, Title IV-A urban, Title IV-A rural.

T-tests for the differences between two means for community activities were computed to determine group differences for the after day care fathers and between the after day care and before day care fathers and between the after day care and the waiting list fathers. The results were the following:

a. After day care sample of fathers:

1. The private day care fathers had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A day care fathers ($p < .05$).
2. There was no significant difference between the urban day care fathers and the rural day care sample of fathers ($p < .05$).
3. There was no significant difference between the private urban day care sample of fathers and the private rural day care fathers ($p < .05$).
4. Both the private urban and the private rural fathers had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A rural and Title IV-A urban fathers ($p < .05$).
5. There was no significant difference between the Title IV-A rural fathers and the Title IV-A urban sample of fathers.

b. After day care sample vs. before day care sample:

1. While this type of comparison is not statistically correct (as the scores do not represent two independent groups), it should be noted that in every group a mean score increase was reported.

c. After day care fathers vs. waiting list fathers:

1. There were no significant differences between any of the sample groups ($p < .05$).

Table 11 offers a closer look at the actual changes which occurred in the day care group. The Title IV-A rural sample had significantly fewer changes than the private urban and Title IV-A urban sample ($p < .05$). Also the Title IV-A rural changes were significantly fewer in number than the private rural sample at the .065 level of significance.

TABLE 10
MEAN SCORES FOR THE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
OF THE WAITING LIST, BEFORE DAY CARE
AND AFTER DAY CARE FATHERS

	Waiting List		Before Day Care		After Day Care	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Private rural	3	9.000	34	7.500	34	7.971
Title IV-A rural	30	4.267	28	1.750	28	2.214
Private urban	6	7.333	30	8.767	30	11.500
Title IV-A urban	15	4.933	31	4.226	31	4.290
Private	9	7.889	64	8.094	64	9.625
Title IV-A	45	4.489	52	3.050	52	3.305
Urban	21	5.619	61	6.459	61	7.836
Rural	33	4.697	62	4.903	62	5.371
Total	54	5.056	123	5.675	123	6.593

TABLE 11
CHANGE OCCURRING IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
OF DAY CARE FATHERS

Type	N	Increase	Decrease	Same	% Change
Private rural	34	7	3	24	29
Title IV-A rural	28	3	0	25	11
Private urban	30	8	4	18	40
Title IV-A urban	31	9	5	17	45
Private	64	15	7	42	34
Title IV-A	59	12	5	42	29
Urban	61	17	9	35	31
Rural	62	10	3	49	21

Other factors were investigated which might influence participation in the community, i.e., the race, income, education, SES of the fathers. The race of the fathers was found to have no significant effect on participation. When multiple regression equations were calculated with the present community participation as the dependent variable and the income, education, and SES of the father as independent variables, SES was found to be the best indicator of community participation (.481 correlation coefficient), followed by education (.339 correlation coefficient), and then income (.259 correlation coefficient). Table 12 shows the correlation between the various levels of SES and the mean scores for community activities at each level.

TABLE 12
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SES AND
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES OF FATHERS

SES Level	Community Activities Mean Score	N
0	.500	2
1	1.591	22
2	4.105	76
3	8.815	27
4	8.867	15
5	8.273	11
6	9.917	12
7	14.091	11
		177

Mothers. Tables 13 and 14 show the distribution of scores for the before day care CAI of day care mothers and the CAI of the waiting list mothers. Again the high percentage of 0 scores (53%) in the Title IV-A rural sample is notable.

TABLE 13
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX FOR THE FOUR MAIN
CLASSIFICATIONS OF BEFORE DAY CARE
AND WAITING LIST MOTHERS

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care mothers										
High	4	11	3	10	7	21	4	13	18	14
Medium	9	24	1	3	7	21	9	29	26	20
Low	8	22	10	33	11	32	13	42	42	32
0	16	43	16	53	9	26	5	16	46	35
Waiting list mothers										
High	0	0	2	6	2	33	3	18	7	12
Medium	2	67	8	25	1	17	6	35	17	29
Low	1	33	10	31	3	50	5	29	19	33
0	0	0	12	38	0	0	3	18	15	26

TABLE 14
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX OF BEFORE DAY CARE
AND WAITING LIST MOTHERS ACCORDING TO
TYPE OF FUNDING AND LOCATION OF CENTER

	Private		Title IV-A		Urban		Rural		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care mothers										
High	11	15	7	11	11	17	7	10	18	14
Medium	16	23	10	16	16	25	10	15	26	20
Low	19	27	23	38	24	37	18	27	42	32
0	25	35	21	34	14	22	32	48	46	35
Waiting list mothers										
High	2	22	5	10	5	22	2	6	7	12
Medium	3	33	14	29	7	30	10	29	17	29
Low	4	44	15	31	8	35	11	31	19	33
0	0	0	15	31	3	13	12	34	15	26

The mean scores for the two groups were computed (Table 15). The divisions of both groups showed the same order of progression from highest to lowest, i.e., private urban, Title IV-A urban, private rural, Title IV-A rural. This progression differed from that of the fathers in that there was an inversion of order for two divisions, the Title IV-A urban and private rural.

T-tests for the differences between two means for community activities were computed to determine group differences for the before day care mothers, for the waiting list mothers, and between the before day care and waiting list mothers. The following were the results:

TABLE 15
MEAN SCORES FOR THE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES OF
BEFORE DAY CARE AND WAITING LIST MOTHERS

	Before Day Care		Waiting List	
	N	Mean	N	Mean
Private rural	37	5.882	3	7.333
Title IV-A rural	30	2.357	32	4.100
Private urban	34	8.467	6	10.333
Title IV-A urban	31	6.710	17	8.800
Private	71	7.094	9	9.333
Title IV-A	61	4.644	49	5.667
Urban	65	7.574	23	9.238
Rural	67	4.290	35	4.394
Total	132	5.919	58	6.278

a. Before day care mothers:

1. The urban before day care mothers had a significantly higher mean score than the rural before day care mothers ($p < .05$).

2. The private rural, private urban, and Title IV-A urban day care groups had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A rural day care sample ($p < .05$).

3. There were no significant differences found between any other groups of before day care mothers in the sample ($p < .05$).

b. Waiting list mothers:

1. The urban waiting list mothers had a significantly higher mean score than the rural waiting list mothers ($p < .05$).

2. The Title IV-A urban waiting list sample had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A rural waiting list sample ($p < .05$).

3. There were no significant differences found between any other groups of waiting list mothers in the sample ($p < .05$).

c. Before day care mothers vs. waiting list mothers:

1. There were no significant differences found between any of these groups ($p < .05$).

The after day care CAI is indicated in Table 16 for the day care mothers, and Table 17 shows the distribution by location and funding source. When comparing the before day care scores with the after day care scores, the day care mothers either did not change their participation or their participation in the high and medium categories decreased.

TABLE 16

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX OF THE DAY CARE MOTHERS
AFTER PARTICIPATION ACCORDING TO THE FOUR MAIN GROUPS

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	4	11	4	13	7	21	6	19	21	16
Medium	8	22	1	3	6	18	7	23	22	17
Low	10	27	11	37	13	38	12	39	46	35
0	15	41	14	47	8	24	6	19	43	33

TABLE 17
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INDEX OF THE DAY CARE
MOTHERS AFTER PARTICIPATION ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF FUNDING AND LOCATION OF CENTER

	Private		Title IV-A		Urban		Rural		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	11	15	10	16	13	20	8	12	21	16
Medium	14	20	8	13	13	20	9	13	22	17
Low	23	32	23	37	25	38	21	31	46	35
0	23	32	20	32	14	22	29	43	43	33

The mean scores for the day care mothers after participation were also calculated (Table 18). They fell in the same order from highest to lowest as the mean before day care scores, i.e., private urban, Title IV-A urban, private rural, Title IV-A rural. The decrease in mean score in the private rural sample should be noted.

T-tests for the differences between two means for community activities were computed to determine group differences for the day care mothers after participation and between the day care mothers' scores before and after participation and between the day care mothers after participation and the waiting list mothers. The results were the following:

a. After day care mothers:

1. The urban day care mothers had a significantly higher mean score than the rural day care mothers ($p < .05$).

2. The private urban mothers had a significantly higher mean score than the Title IV-A rural mothers ($p < .05$).

3. There were no significant differences between the other groups of day care mothers ($p < .05$).

b. After day care mothers vs. before day care mothers:

1. These mean scores could not be evaluated using a T-test as the scores did not represent two independent samples.

c. After day care mothers vs. waiting list mothers:

1. There were no significant differences between any of these sample groups ($p < .05$).

TABLE 18
MEAN SCORES FOR THE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
OF THE WAITING LIST, BEFORE DAY CARE
AND AFTER DAY CARE MOTHERS

	Waiting List		Before Day Care		After Day Care	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Private rural	3	7.333	37	5.882	37	5.441
Title IV-A rural	32	4.100	30	2.357	30	4.179
Private urban	6	10.333	34	8.467	34	8.800
Title IV-A urban	17	8.800	31	6.710	31	7.484
Private	9	9.333	71	7.094	71	7.016
Title IV-A	49	5.667	61	4.644	61	5.915
Urban	23	9.238	65	7.574	65	8.131
Rural	35	4.394	67	4.290	67	4.871
Total	58	6.278	132	5.919	132	6.488

The actual changes in the involvement of the day care mothers were significant in only one area (Table 19). The Title IV-A urban sample had a significantly higher percentage of change than the private rural sample ($p < .05$). The Title IV-A urban sample would be responsible for the heightened urban day care and Title IV-A day care changes.

TABLE 19
CHANGE OCCURRING IN COMMUNITY
ACTIVITIES OF DAY CARE MOTHERS

Type	N	Increase	Decrease	Same	% Change
Private rural	37	7	5	25	32
Title IV-A rural	30	11	0	19	37
Private urban	34	8	5	21	38
Title IV-A urban	31	12	6	13	58
Private	71	15	10	46	35
Title IV-A	61	23	6	32	48
Rural	67	18	5	44	34
Urban	65	20	11	34	48

Other factors were investigated which might have influenced the day care mothers' community participation. They are: race, employment, income, education, SES.

The race of the mothers was found to have no significant effect on the mean community participation score. However, the mean scores were strikingly different: 8.098 black women, 5.477 white women. One must assume that some black mothers are very active.

There was no significant difference in the rate of participation between unemployed mothers, employed mothers, and mothers in training. Table 20 indicates the employment classification of the women and their present mean community involvement score. It should be noted that the score is larger for employed mothers and mothers in training than it is for unemployed mothers.

TABLE 20
EMPLOYMENT CLASSIFICATION AND MEAN COMMUNITY
ACTIVITIES SCORE OF THE DAY CARE MOTHERS

Status	Mean Score	N
Unemployed	5.3226	93
Employed	6.5667	90
Training	7.2857	7

When multiple regression equations were calculated with the present community participation as the dependent variable and income, education, and the SES of the mothers as independent variables, a mother's education was found to be the best indicator of her community participation (.305 correlation coefficient), followed by SES (.296 correlation coefficient), and then income (.120 correlation coefficient). These correlations were not as strong as in the sample of fathers because a large number of mothers were not working. Unemployment would decidedly lower their SES and income correlation coefficients. Table 21 indicates the relationship between the change in the SES level and the mean community activities score of the day care mothers after participation.

TABLE 21
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SES AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES
OF DAY CARE MOTHERS AFTER PARTICIPATION

SES Level	Community Activities Mean Score	N
0	0.0	0
1	3.1000	10
2	3.6176	34
3	3.9818	55
4	7.3500	60
5	10.4500	20
6	12.6667	9
7	0.0	2

Community Power Structure

The entire female sample of 132 mothers with one or more children in day care and 58 mothers with a child's name on a waiting list were asked to identify organized groups and individuals in the community who supported or did not support day care services. Four responses in each category (supporting groups, nonsupporting groups, supporting individuals, nonsupporting individuals) were expected, or a total of 760 responses to each question. The male population was not interviewed about the community power structure.

In response to the questions dealing with groups or individuals who supported or did not support day care in the community, the most frequently

mentioned group was community residents who were, in fact individuals. The low response to group identification is notable. Of the groups mentioned, civic groups, church related organizations, individual churches, and government supported social service agencies were most frequently cited (see Tables 22 and 23).

The majority of women found it easier to name individuals in the community rather than formal groups (see Tables 24 and 25). It is noteworthy that 68% of the responses pertained to community residents, while an additional 11% were day care users/providers. Of those people favoring day care, social service employees were mentioned 24 times, and government officials or community leaders were mentioned 12 times. While few responses were made pertaining to people who did not favor day care (31 responses), a total of 6, or 19.3%, of these individuals were government officials or leaders.

TABLE 22
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES CONCERNING GROUPS
SUPPORTING DAY CARE SERVICES

Type of Organization	No. of Responses*	% of Total Responses
Civic group	39	22
Church or church organization	38	22
Government supported social service	37	21
Nongovernment supported social service	5	2
Day care groups	22	12
Business or professional groups	6	3
Government groups	2	1
Community residents	38	22

*Of 760 possible responses, 177 were recorded from 105 respondents. (48% of the sample was unable to respond to this question)

TABLE 23
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES CONCERNING GROUPS
NOT SUPPORTING DAY CARE SERVICES

Type of Organization	No. of Responses*	% of Total Response
Civic group	1	7
Church or church organization	1	7
Government supported social service	1	7
Nongovernment supported social service	1	7
Day care groups	0	0
Business or professional groups	1	7
Government groups	0	0
Community residents	10	67

*Of 760 possible responses, 15 were recorded from 14 respondents.
(93% of the sample was unable to respond to this question)

TABLE 24
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES CONCERNING INDIVIDUALS
FAVORING DAY CARE SERVICES

Type of Organization	No. of Responses*	% of Total Response
Civic organization member	17	5
Church organization member	15	5
Social service employee	24	8
Day care user/provider	35	11
Business or professional association member	1	3
Government official or community leader	12	4
Community resident	216	68

*Of 760 possible responses, 320 were recorded from 125 respondents.
(34% of the sample was unable to respond to this question)

TABLE 25
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES CONCERNING INDIVIDUALS
NOT FAVORING DAY CARE SERVICES

Type of Organization	No. of Responses*	% of Total Responses
Civic organization member	1	3
Church organization member	2	7
Social service employee	0	0
Day care user/provider	0	0
Business or professional association member	1	3
Government official or community leader	6	19
Community resident	21	68

*Of 760 possible responses, 31 were recorded from 19 respondents.
(90% of the sample was unable to respond to this question)

It would be useful to determine the types of responses given by each group of day care users and waiting list mothers. However, there was no significant difference in the kind of responses given by any one group to any question. Each group tended to mention the same types of individuals or organizations. There were differences in the number of total responses between the in-day care and waiting list sample. One might hypothesize that the participants in day care might be more responsive to the community influences affecting that service, but this was not always the case.

In response to naming "groups favoring day care services," there was a larger response from the day care group significant at the .06 level. This emphasis is attributable to the high response of the rural day care sample (73 responses of 268 possible responses, or 27%). There were no significant differences between the other groups.

When considering the question of "groups opposed to day care services," the response of the waiting list sample was significantly greater at the .05 level. When further analyzed, this difference can be attributed to a combination of the significantly higher rural waiting list response and a higher Title IV-A response; therefore the responsibility for the higher response lies with the Title IV-A rural waiting list sample (responding 7 times out of a possible 140, or 5%).

The private urban waiting list sample responded significantly higher at the .05 level when responses to "individuals favoring the service" were examined. There was no difference found between the day care and waiting list samples ($p < .05$). Upon further investigation the urban waiting list sample responded a significantly greater number of times than the urban day care sample, and the private waiting list sample responded significantly higher than the private day care group ($p < .05$). The private urban waiting list sample was therefore the higher respondent (14 responses out of a possible 24, or 58%). It should be pointed out that the population of the private urban waiting list sample ($N = 24$) was small in comparison to the rest of the sample.

In the category "persons opposed to day care," there was no significant differences in the group responses.

In general, it was felt that day care services of any type in a community would be influenced by the attitudes of one or more of the following groups: the church, community organizations, and local government. In

order to pinpoint the sample's knowledge of the influence of these groups, the women were asked their opinion of the various groups' attitudes toward day care.

There was no significant difference between the total day care and non-day care groups in the distribution of their answers toward the church ($p < .05$) (Table 26). However, it is notable that 50-60% of the total sample in both groups said the church favored day care services and only one individual felt their church was against the service.

In a similar manner the total group percentages showed no significant difference in the opinions of community organizations (Table 27). The day care group, however, had a significantly higher percentage of respondents in the category "no opinion." ($p < .05$)

TABLE 26
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES ON THE
ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD DAY CARE

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care mothers										
No opinion	4	11	9	30	4	12	4	13	21	16
Divided	1	3	1	3	4	12	1	3	7	5
Against	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	.7
In favor	29	78	16	53	17	50	16	53	78	59
Waiting list mothers										
No opinion	0	0	4	13	1	17	2	12	7	12
Divided	1	33	4	13	0	0	2	12	7	12
Against	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In favor	2	67	16	50	4	67	7	41	29	50

TABLE 27
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES ON THE ATTITUDE OF
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS TOWARD DAY CARE

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care mothers										
No opinion	9	24.3	5	16.7	6	17.6	4	13.3	24	18.2
Divided	0	0	1	3.3	3	8.8	0	0	4	3.0
Against	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In favor	20	54.1	17	56.7	12	35.3	10	33.3	59	44.7
Waiting list mothers										
No opinion	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	1	5.9	2	3.4
Divided	0	0	3	9.4	0	0	3	17.6	6	10.3
Against	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
In favor	1	33.3	14	43.8	3	50.0	4	23.5	22	37.9

It should be noted that the data on the church and community organizations came from an uncontrolled sample, i.e., the respondents could have been referring to 100 different churches or any number or combination of community groups. In this respect, a comparison of answers or statistical analysis is quite difficult. Only the broadest generalizations can be made, such as 50-60% of the respondents felt the church favored day care services and the fact that this percentage was higher than the 34-45% who felt that civic organizations in their community favored the services.

The topic of local government was more defined. Responses related to at least 25 local government systems. Table 28 shows the distribution of

answers on the position of this group. There was a significantly greater percentage of responses in the category "no opinion" in the day care group, but a larger percentage of the waiting list group responded that they felt local government was against day care ($p < .05$). At the same significance level there was no difference between the groups agreeing that local government favored day care (22-33%).

TABLE 28
SAMPLE'S RESPONSES ON THE ATTITUDE
OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT TOWARD DAY CARE

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Day care mothers										
No opinion	4	10.8	5	16.7	10	29.4	5	16.7	24	18.2
Divided	2	5.4	4	13.3	6	17.6	6	20.0	18	13.6
Against	0	0	2	6.7	0	0	0	0	2	1.5
In favor	17	45.9	13	43.3	5	14.7	9	30.0	44	33.3
Waiting list mothers										
No opinion	0	0	1	3.1	2	33.3	0	0	3	5.2
Divided	0	0	3	9.4	2	33.3	3	17.6	8	13.8
Against	0	0	4	12.5	1	16.7	1	5.9	6	10.3
In favor	1	33.3	8	25.0	0	0	5	29.4	13	22.4

It might prove more meaningful to consider the number of respondents in each group who felt they could not evaluate the position of the church, civic organizations, or the government. Table 29 shows the number of mothers in each group who did not respond. There was no significant difference in nonrespondents in the day care and waiting list groups on the

position of the church. When questioned about the attitude of civic organizations, there was no significant difference in the number of nonrespondents in any group. On the position of local government, the Title IV-A rural waiting list group held a significantly higher percentage of nonrespondents ($p < .05$).

TABLE 29
SAMPLE NOT RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS ON THE CHURCH,
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Church										
Day care	3	8.1	4	13.3	9	26.5	9	29.0	25	18.9
Waiting	0	0	8	25.0	1	16.7	6	35.3	15	25.9
Community organizations										
Day care	8	21.6	7	23.3	13	38.2	17	54.8	45	34.1
Waiting	2	66.7	13	40.6	3	50.0	9	52.9	27	46.6
Local government										
Day care	14	37.8	6	20.0	13	38.2	11	35.5	44	33.3
Waiting	2	66.7	16	50.0	1	16.7	8	47.1	27	46.6

When the sample were regrouped into the categories private, Title IV-A, urban, and rural, participation in a day care program became a positive factor in identifying groups and individuals in the rural sample. Table 30 indicates where a significant difference in the number of nonrespondents was found.

TABLE 30
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NUMBER OF NONRESPONDENTS

Group	No. of Nonrespondent
Private day care vs. private waiting	No significant differences ($p < .05$)
Title IV-A day care vs. Title IV-A waiting	Significantly greater non- response from waiting sample on topic of government ($p < .05$)
Urban day care vs. urban waiting	No significant differences on any topic ($p < .05$)
Rural day care vs. rural waiting	Significantly greater non- response from waiting sample on topics of civic organizations, local government ($p < .05$)

Parent Participation and Community Outreach

One of the most important services a day care center performs is the education of the parents which enables them to (a) participate to greater degrees in day care decision making and (b) participate in the community. The day care sample, both fathers and mothers, were asked if they had attended any parent education courses. Table 31 shows the number of fathers and mothers who had attended such courses.

The three fathers who received parent education represented three different centers (2 Title IV-A and 1 private), and the four mothers (one woman in the Title IV-A urban group took two courses) represented three different centers (2 Title IV-A and 1 private). The centers from which the mothers responded were different than those from which the fathers responded. Therefore, six day care centers were represented for

TABLE 31

NUMBER OF FATHERS AND MOTHERS RECEIVING PARENT EDUCATION

Topic	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Fathers					
Housekeeping skills	0	0	0	0	0
Child rearing	0	0	1	1	2
Basic education	0	1	0	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Mothers					
Housekeeping skills	0	0	1	0	1
Child rearing	0	0	0	2	2
Basic education	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	1	0	1	2

the total day care population (4 Title IV-A and 2 private). If the categories are broken down further, it can be seen that the centers represented two Title IV-A rural, two Title IV-A urban, and two private urban centers. The private rural centers were not represented by either the fathers or the mothers. Table 32 shows the number of participants and types of education offered to the total sample, both men and women.

The day care parents were also asked if any of the following were offered by their centers to assist their participation in the programs offered: rides, payment for attendance, babysitting, lunch or dinner,

TABLE 32
SAMPLE RECEIVING PARENT EDUCATION

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Housekeeping skills	0	0	1	0	1
Child rearing	0	0	1	3	4
Basic education	0	1	0	0	1
Other	0	1	0	1	2
Total	0	2	2	4 (3)*	8 (7)*

*One person took 2 courses

choice of time, other. One father from a private urban center responded that the participants were able to choose the time. The same service was indicated by two mothers as well; two mothers from Title IV-A urban centers were able to choose the time when their course was offered. No other service was made available.

In order to determine the degree of participation of the parents in the centers, i.e., the type of participation which would be valuable toward meeting the goal of increased community participation, the fathers and mothers were asked many questions about whether they served on advisory boards, held offices, or worked as a volunteer or paid worker at the centers. Table 33 indicates the number of fathers and mothers who either had participated in the past or were then serving as an advisory board member, and if they were or ever had been an officer such as president, vice president, secretary. A significantly higher

number of mothers were involved in advisory board activities ($p < .05$). The fathers were involved only in the private urban centers to any degree, and their complete lack of participation in the private rural centers should be noted.

TABLE 33
ADVISORY BOARD PARTICIPATION OF FATHERS AND MOTHERS

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Fathers					
Board members	0	1	4	0	5
Officer presently	0	(Other) 1	(Pres.) 1	0	2
Officer in past	0	(Other) 1	(Other) 2	0	3
Mothers					
Board members	1	7	6	6	20
Officer presently	0	(Pres.) 2	(1 Pres.) (2 V. Pres.) 2	(Other) 2	6
Officer in past	0	(1 Sec.) (1 Pres.) 2	0	(Other) 1	3

Parents were asked about their participation in a long list of volunteer or paid positions at the center. Table 34 indicates the fathers' responses. Again, the private rural centers had not involved the men in the centers, and the private urban centers had involved the most men. There were no Title IV-A-private differences significant at the .05 level.

The sample of fathers was asked the number of hours, and how often, they performed these duties. Twenty of the respondents indicated they participated for a few hours monthly or from time to time. The teacher/aide from the private urban center worked daily for 1 hour, and one father from a Title IV-A rural center performed a job not listed (other) for 3 hours a day.

TABLE 34
VOLUNTEER OR PAID POSITIONS HELD BY FATHERS

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Babysitter	0	0	1	0	1
Kitchen helper	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	1	0	0	1
Clerical work	0	0	0	0	0
Maintenance	0	1	0	2	3
Shopper	0	0	1	0	1
Fund raiser	0	2	4	3	9
Storyteller	0	0	0	0	0
Recruit volunteers	0	0	1	0	1
Teacher/aide	0	1	1	0	2
Social worker	0	0	0	0	0
Nurse/aide	0	0	0	0	0
Nutritionist	0	0	0	0	0
Director	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	2	2	0	4
Total	0	7	10	5	22

The participation of the mothers differed from that of the fathers (Table 35). The number of women involved was significantly higher than that of the fathers ($p < .05$). Also the number of Title IV-A mothers participating was significantly higher than the number of private mothers ($p < .05$). The low participation of the private rural women is notable. It was this group that lowered the level of private participation. There was no significant differences between participation in Title IV-A rural or Title IV-A urban and the private urban ($p < .05$).

TABLE 35
VOLUNTEER OR PAID POSITIONS HELD BY MOTHERS

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Babysitter	0	5	0	1	6
Kitchen helper	0	1	0	1	2
Transportation	0	0	2	0	2
Clerical work	0	0	0	0	0
Maintenance	0	0	1	0	1
Shopper	0	0	2	3	5
Fund raiser	0	7	6	4	17
Storyteller	1	3	0	1	5
Recruit volunteers	0	0	1	0	1
Teacher/aide	0	3	0	2	5
Social worker	0	0	1	0	1
Nurse/aide	0	0	0	0	0
Nutritionist	0	0	0	0	0
Director	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	3	3	6
Total	1	19	16	15	51

Mothers were also asked how long and how often they participated at the center. Forty-eight mothers responded that they participated a few hours a month or from time to time. One Title IV-A rural mother worked daily as a storyteller and one Title IV-A urban mother worked 2 hours a day and another worked 8 hours a day as a teacher/aide.

One of the key steps to increased community participation is the utilization of community services, the knowledge of their existence, and the realization of what is needed in the community. The day care sample was questioned concerning their use of social services at their centers and/or referrals to community services. Table 36 indicates the number of fathers and mothers who received social services at their day care centers. No private rural parent received services at a center, and only one father received any services from a center, a Title IV-A urban one. A significantly higher number of mothers at Title IV-A centers than those from private centers received social services at the day care center ($p < .05$). No women from the private rural centers received services.

Some parents were referred to community services (Table 37). Once again no private rural parents were referred elsewhere. All parents were asked if the day care center checked with them after referral was made. None of the fathers could remember a check being made, but four mothers did.

Table 38 indicates the total sample, fathers and mothers, who received services either at the center or in the community. A significantly larger number of the parents attending Title IV-A centers received social services than those attending private centers ($p < .05$). The total lack of services or referrals at private rural centers should be noted; also the Title IV-A urban centers, while offering in-center services, did not refer their clients to community services.

TABLE 36
SERVICES RECEIVED BY FATHERS AND MOTHERS
AT CENTERS

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Fathers					
Job counseling	0	0	0	0	0
Marriage counseling	0	0	0	1	1
Financial counseling	0	0	0	0	0
Health & nutri- tion counseling	0	0	0	0	0
Job training	0	0	0	0	0
Prenatal counseling	0	0	0	0	0
Family planning	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	1	1
Mothers					
Job counseling	0	0	0	0	0
Marriage counseling	0	0	0	1	1
Financial counseling	0	0	1	2	3
Health & nutri- tion counseling	0	2	0	1	3
Job training	0	0	0	0	0
Prenatal counseling	0	0	0	0	0
Family planning	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	2	1	4	7

TABLE 37
FATHERS AND MOTHERS REFERRED TO SERVICES IN COMMUNITY

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
Fathers					
Homemaker services	0	0	0	0	0
Job training	0	1	0	0	1
Mental health services	0	0	0	0	0
Physical health services	0	1	2	0	3
Legal services	0	1	0	0	1
Housing	0	0	0	0	0
Family planning	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	3	2	0	5
Mothers					
Homemaker services	0	0	0	0	0
Job training	0	0	0	0	0
Mental health services	0	1✓*	0	0	1
Physical health services	0	2 ¹ -✓	3 ¹ -✓	0	5
Legal services	0	0	0	0	0
Housing	0	0	0	0	0
Family planning	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	1✓	0	0	1
Total	0	4	3	0	7

*✓ indicates that center checked on referral.

TABLE 38
SAMPLE RECEIVING SOCIAL SERVICES

	Private Rural	Title IV-A Rural	Private Urban	Title IV-A Urban	Total Group
No.	0	9	6	5	20
Percent	0	15.5	9.4	8.1	10.5

DISCUSSION

The tone of government literature on the purposes of parent involvement indicates that parents need to develop leadership skills; they need to develop their knowledge about their community in order to increase their participation in it; they need to develop an awareness of community services-- what services exist, where they are, and what more is needed. Involvement in day care centers (at least in those that are government funded) should provide parents with the opportunity to meet these ends.

Participation in education courses, involvement in advisory board activities, training courses and work at day care centers, reception of social services at the centers, and referral to community services are all tools which should be provided by the centers in order for the system to work. The Kirschner report (1970) shows that the system has a greater chance of working where parent involvement in the center is high.

Fathers

The centers in this study have done little to involve the fathers in the day care sample in their activity. Three fathers received parent education. Only 22 actively participated as center staff, even at the

very minimal level of fund raiser or transportation driver. One father received in-center social services, and 5 received referral services. Five out of the 123 fathers in the sample participated on an advisory board.

Except in one instance (private urban centers) there was little increase in the community activity of fathers after their children began to attend a day care program. However, this small amount of increase is not surprising, as one would expect to find little increase if the prerequisites of participation are not being met. And they were not being met in the centers in this study.

One case stands out as being different, that of the private urban centers. These fathers had the highest SES of the group and participated the most in community activities. Their participation increased the greatest of any group after day care began. They were also the only group to be involved to any extent in day care decision making--Four of the five male advisory board members in the sample belonged to this group.

In contrast, the private rural center fathers had the second highest SES and the second highest participation means before and after day care. However, they were not involved in their centers and their mean increase was minimal.

The conclusions to be drawn are that the community participation of fathers might well remain primarily a function of factors associated with SES, but the level of participation may be increased through the education and socialization process suggested by government literature, as was the case in the private urban sample.

Mothers

An appreciably greater number of mothers were involved in day care than fathers. Four women participated in parent education courses. Fifty-one served their centers as volunteer or paid staff. Twenty mothers served on advisory boards. Fourteen received social services at their day care centers or were referred to the community for services.

There was a definite urban advantage for mothers when community participation is considered. Perhaps it is more acceptable for mothers to be active outside of the home in urban areas.

While there was no significant difference between the mean participation scores of working and nonworking mothers ($p < .05$), the mean scores after day care showed a slightly higher mean for those employed. This finding is in line with that of Ruderman, who found that working mothers "are appreciably more likely to belong to organizations or clubs, and to belong to two or more, than non-working mothers...[1968, p. 179]." This conclusion is important, as it dispels any suppositions that the high employment rate among some women would decrease their community participation.

The most important distinction to be considered with day care mothers is that between those attending Title IV-A funded and privately funded centers. Even though the urban centers (both Title IV-A and private) had the greatest participation both before and after day care, the greatest increase in mean score occurred in the Title IV-A centers. A closer look reveals that, while a considerable number of mothers in the entire group decreased their activity, the rate of positive change was greatest in Title IV-A centers--38%, as compared to a 21% change in a positive direction for private centers.

An examination of the centers shows that, while a higher percentage of Title IV-A mothers served as staff, participated on advisory boards, attended education courses, and received social services, the difference, at first glance, was dependent upon the great lack of participation from private rural centers. A closer look reveals that participation was also more meaningful in the Title IV-A centers. In these centers four women were storytellers, as compared to one woman from a private center, and five were teacher/aides, as compared to none from a private center. It seems that as many mothers were involved in private urban centers, but their level of participation was one of less responsibility. This trend is shown further when participation on an advisory board is considered. Of the twenty mothers involved in boards (13 Title IV-A, 7 private), seven Title IV-A center mothers served at one time as an officer, as compared to two in the private center group.

We can conclude, then, that the greatest impetus for the community participation of women is in the urban area, regardless of type of center or SES. However, when the factor of day care participation is considered, the urban women still remain the highest participants, but the greatest impetus for positive change (increase of participation) comes from the Title IV-A centers, both urban and rural. As with male participation, the greatest effects of day care on community participation are felt by the mothers attending those centers which provide the most meaningful opportunities to increase their skill and knowledge: the private urban centers for fathers, the Title IV-A centers for mothers.

For unexplained reasons these findings agree with those of Allen (1968), who studied the social organization participation of preschool parents. He found that preschool mothers from government funded centers and preschool fathers from privately funded centers were more active than preschool mothers from privately funded centers and preschool fathers from government funded centers.

The female sample only was questioned about community power structure. Few individuals from either sample, day care or waiting list, could identify the position of organized groups in their community on day care. Day care must not be a highly debated topic in the community or, if it is, the strong opinions of those who do discuss it are not well known. When the percentage of the sample not responding to this part of the study is considered, the waiting list sample was more highly represented in the rural areas. Hopefully, participation in day care will make these individuals more sensitive to community opinion.

Generally, it would seem that participation in day care services, private or Title IV-A, makes one neither more aware of the power structure affecting day care nor of individual opinion within the community.

Suggestions for Future Studies

A longitudinal study involving Title IV-A parents and a control group of parents uninvolved in day care, but with the same SES, could help answer some of the questions about effects of day care on community awareness and participation. The motivation of parents to place a child in day care should be considered to determine how this one fact makes the Title IV-A parent different from a control group parent of the same SES and background. It has been suggested that government programs are oriented toward the middle class. Perhaps the decision to place a child

in day care shows a middle-class aspiration that is missing in a parent who does not place a child in day care.

It would also be useful to study the relationship between community participation and actual day care participation. Material for such a study is available through the Pennsylvania Day Care Study.

And, finally, the features of private centers, or the attributes of the fathers whose children use these centers, that contribute to the private center fathers being higher community participants than Title IV-A fathers should be studied. At the same time Title IV-A centers and Title IV-A mothers should be studied to determine what makes Title IV-A mothers higher participants than private center mothers.

SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this report was to obtain a general view of what is happening in day care in Pennsylvania with regard to parent participation in the governing of day care and its relationship to the community participation activities of day care participants. The following observations were made:

a. Fathers:

1. The mean scores of community participation before and after day care fell into the same order from highest to lowest as the group SES and mean annual income: private urban, private rural, Title IV-A urban, Title IV-A rural. The mean score of the participation of the waiting list group fell into approximately the same pattern, but it was somewhat distorted by the elevated mean score of the small private rural waiting list group. SES was found to be the best indicator of father's participation.

2. The private day care group had a significantly higher mean score before day care than the Title IV-A day care group. There was no significant difference between the urban and rural groups.

3. There was no significant difference between the day care group's score before or after day care and the participation of the waiting list group. The mean participation scores after day care increased, but were not significantly higher, for all day care groups; they were not always higher than the mean scores of the waiting list groups.

4. Sixty-four percent of the Title IV-A rural group had a participation score of 0 before day care. This figure decreased to 61% after day care.

5. The private day care group had a significantly higher mean score after day care than the Title IV-A day care group. There was no significant difference between the urban and rural groups.

6. The data indicated that the Title IV-A rural group was affected the least by day care as reflected in their community participation scores. The data indicated that private urban fathers play a more meaningful, powerful role in their centers than Title IV-A fathers.

b. Mothers:

1. The mean scores of participation before and after day care and those for the waiting sample fell into the following order from highest to lowest: private urban, Title IV-A urban, private rural, Title IV-A rural. The mothers' education was found to be the best indicator of community participation.

2. The urban day care group had a significantly higher mean score than the rural day care group in the before day care mean, the after day care mean, and the participation mean of the waiting list group.

3. There was no significant difference found between the before and after participation means of the day care group and the waiting list group's participation mean.

4. There was little relationship between participation in day care and the awareness of the community power structure. Only in the rural sample was there any indication of such. On the opinions of civic organizations and local government pertaining to day care, there were significantly more nonrespondents in the rural waiting list group than in the rural day care group. The data indicates that Title IV-A mothers participate in more meaningful and powerful activities in their centers than private mothers do.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, J. G. Impact of the family as a primary group upon the child in a Head Start preschool. In Willerman, E. G., Newton, U. S., and Bussis, D. E. (Eds.), A digest of research activities of regional evaluation and research centers for Project Head Start (September 1, 1966 to November 30, 1967) New York: The Institute for Educational Development, 1968.
- Chandler, M. Project Head Start and the culturally deprived in Rochester, New York. A study of participating families in areas served by Project Head Start in Rochester. New York: Rochester Area Council of Churches, 1966.
- Costello, J., & Binstock, E. Review and summary of a national survey of the parent-child center programs. (HE 21.202: p. 21) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Hoffman, D. B. Parent participation in pre-school day care. Atlanta, Ga.: Southeastern Education Laboratory, 1971.
- Kirschner Associates, Inc. A national survey of the impacts of head start centers on community institutions. (HE 21.202: Im 7) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Kitano, H. Measurement of change in social and personal attitudes of children in Project Head Start. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Head Start Evaluation and Research, 1969.
- Kraft, I., & Chilman, C. S. Helping low income families through parent education, a survey of research. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Myers, L., Elliott, V., Harrell, J., & Hostetter, M. J. The family and community day care interview. (Technical Report No. 6) University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, The Pennsylvania Dare Care Study Project, 1972.
- Parker, R. A statement of principles--Day care U. S. A. (HE 21.11: p.93) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Ruderman, F. A. Child care and working mothers. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1968.
- Thompson, R. Factors resulting in variations in citizen interest, involvement, and support of their local school systems. Eugene, Ore.: Oregon University, Institute for Comparative Experimental Research on Behavioral Systems, 1970.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Project Head Start 1968: The development of a program. (HE 21.202: H34/3/968) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start -- Parents are needed, 6. (Pr Ex 10: 12:6) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start -- Points for parents, 10. (Pr Ex 10: 12:10) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Project Head Start -- Parent involvement, 10A. (Pr Ex 10: 12:10) Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE USE OF DAY
CARE CENTERS UPON THE FAMILY

Center for Human Services Development
College of Human Development
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pa. 16802

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE USE OF DAY
CARE CENTERS UPON THE FAMILY¹

Virginia Elliott

The Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

Families using day care were compared to families on day care waiting lists to determine whether the use of day care is related to economic status. The dependent variables were income level and source, employment status, and use of time. The independent variables were use or nonuse of day care facilities and type and location of center. Results revealed that there was a significant relationship between the use of day care and total income, per capita income, mean net income, and the employment of mothers. All mothers (?) in job training were using day care. Families using private urban day care centers had the highest total and per capita income and number of mothers employed. Of day care users not employed or in training, 52% spent the time their children were away in more household production.

¹This report was prepared under contract with the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare. The opinions and recommendations expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the sponsoring agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
ABSTRACT.....	182
INTRODUCTION.....	185
Economic Status.....	186
Mothers in the Labor Force.....	187
Day Care Services.....	188
Use of Time of Nonworking Wives.....	190
METHODS.....	191
Development of the Instrument.....	191
Selection of the Sample.....	192
Procedure for Interviewing.....	193
Characteristics of the Sample.....	193
RESULTS.....	195
Economic Status of Day Care and Waiting List Families.....	195
Total Monthly Income.....	195
Per Capita Monthly Income.....	198
Percentage of Total Monthly Income Derived from Wages.....	199
Wages of Employed Mothers.....	200
Net Income.....	202
Employment Status of Mothers.....	202
DISCUSSION.....	205
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	208
SUMMARY.....	209
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	210

TABLES

Table 1	Sampling Groups.....	192
Table 2	Employment Status.....	194
Table 3	Total Monthly Income.....	196
Table 4	Total Monthly Income of the Day Care Group by the Type and Location of the Day Care Center.....	197

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 5 Medians for the Total Monthly Incomes.....	198
Table 6 Per Capita Income.....	199
Table 7 Wage Component of Income.....	200
Table 8 Wages of Employed Mothers.....	201
Table 9 Mean Monthly Income of the Mothers.....	201
Table 10 Means of Net Income.....	202
Table 11 Employment Status.....	203
Table 12 Employment Status of the Day Care Mother by the Type and Location of the Day Care Center.....	204
Table 13 Use of Time of Nonworking Day Care Mothers.....	205

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE USE OF DAY
CARE CENTERS UPON THE FAMILY

Virginia Elliott
The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

The eminence of day care has varied throughout United States history. During World War II it became important as the government brought women into industries that produced needed products for the war effort. After the war day care facilities seemingly disappeared, but working mothers remained in the labor force leaving many children unattended. Today even more women are entering the working world than previously, and once again day care is being recognized as a necessity. Many concerned people are even advocating group day care as a way to bring preschool children of poor families out of what they regard as inadequate homes into more adequate developmental settings, and pending federal legislation may provide as much as a billion dollars to stimulate the development of day care services.

To date, many aspects of the use of day care facilities have been studied, but little work has been done on their economic impact on families. The present study tried to bridge this gap by investigating the relationship between the use of day care facilities and the economic status of the family. First the economic status of families using day care facilities was compared with that of a control group of waiting list families. The day care group was also divided according to the type and location of center in order to determine whether there were any intragroup

differences which might have affected the results. Second the employment status of the mothers in the waiting list and day care groups was compared. The free time provided to nonworking mothers through the use of day care facilities was also examined.

Economic Status

Economic status is more complicated than it appears. In 1971 Fried pointed out that the economic condition of a family involves the number of persons supported by a given income, and per capita income estimates provide a more accurate picture of the total economic situation of a family than does the total income itself. Therefore, the present study examines the economic status of families by determining not only total monthly income but also per capita income.

The importance of the economic status of families is brought to light by a review of families who have few economic resources. For instance, one out of every four families in Pennsylvania has an annual income of less than \$5,000. Americans who earned marginal incomes included 12 to 19% of the white population and from 41 to 54% of the nonwhite population. Close to half the nation's poor children belong to families with at least five youngsters present. Most nonworking poor women are either unable to work, unable to find work, or they are discouraged from working by a public policy which encourages a mother to stay home and care for her children. Their job opportunities are limited by problems such as child care, transportation, personal health, and discrimination.

Since economic and occupational prerogatives include opportunities for jobs, purchasing power for goods and services, and the availability of resources for financing a desired standard of living (Blau & Duncan, 1967),

the families in the lower economic and occupational segment of the population must, out of necessity, have a limited life style. They are separated from more advantaged people by many differences, such as lack of mobility, limited education, parental status, and personality characteristics. Fried (1971) pointed out that economic forces are powerful influences on class conditions and cultural orientations, and, therefore, the impact of economic and social forces has a modified and diffused effect on working class subcultures and working class people.

Mothers in the Labor Force

Today, there are more women in the labor force than ever before. Women's skills and abilities are evident on the job and in the community as well as in the home. The working woman is influencing the economic machinery, and womanpower is a national resource.

One might ask what is causing this change in the working force. First of all, the growth of new industries and other technological advances has provided increased opportunities for women in the business world. Second, the decline in the need for physical strength and the greater emphasis on human services has accelerated the change toward multiple family incomes and blurred role definition within the family.

One might also ask why so many women want to work. Nye and Hoffman (1963; pp. 22-39) reported that a mother's decision to work is made up of two components: motivations and facilitators. Motivations are defined as needs and desires, conscious and unconscious, that make employment attractive. Facilitators are those factors which make employment possible.

They reported money as the most frequent motivator. In their study some mothers worked to maintain their standard of living or achieve a level of living comparable to those around them. When financial deprivation occurred a mother entered the labor force out of dire need. Sometimes she worked to pay debts; other times financial desires for "necessities," such as the down payment on a house, a car, dryer, or carpeting, were evident. "Pin money" or money which the mother controlled and spent independently was another financial goal.

Fried (1971) and Mead (1971) also listed money as a prime motivator. They stated that the major inducement to work among women of low or working-class status positions was the compelling necessity to earn additional money. Working-class women in their studies felt that their husbands' earnings were insufficient to support the household. Yet, the number of children in the household was an important deterrent. The more children in the family, the less likely the mother was to be employed.

The attitudes of the family, the community, and the mother herself were reported to play a role in a mother's decision to go to work, either as barriers or facilitators (Nye & Hoffman, 1963, pp. 22-39). Other facilitators were availability of jobs, qualifications, convenience of location and working hours, while the general economic conditions of the country, the conditions of the local area, and the woman's skills, education, and training were important factors which influenced the level and type of job opportunities available.

Dare Care Services

For a long time children have been parceled out by working mothers. In years past "grandma" got the job of sitting or neighbors helped each

other. While one mother "babysat," the others worked, or there were women who babysat by the hour, day, or week, of "latch-key" children looked after themselves.

Nursery school became available for the "well to do," but day care facilities for children outside the home for long hours of the day was still unavailable for lower income families. Child care facilities sponsored by public, church, private and commercial groups were developed with varied requirements for admission. But even then few such centers were able to meet the needs of handicapped children or children with special problems. In fact, most services were custodial in nature rather than developmental.

Today the realization that such fragmented services are an inadequate solution to a fundamental human problem is emerging. A child is an important investment. According to Steiner (1971) the child who needs day care is one who "has a family problem which makes it impossible for his parents to fulfill their parental responsibilities without supplementary help [p. 57]." Attention to all facets of his environment is essential. Arnold (1964) reported that "day care, like other welfare services, provides care for children, protects them from dangerous situations, strengthens family life, prevents many problems from developing and promotes the welfare of children [p. 9-10]." Wise use of day care can contribute developmental experiences essential to adequate growth, especially for children who live in "high risk" situations. Day care should provide service for children where chronic illness of a physical or emotional nature occurs in the home, as well as when parents are unable to provide adequate care due to economic or social conditions.

In addition, day care can provide a "breather" for mothers which enables her to refresh and maintain her own interests as a person. With "free" time she can invest time with other children in the family, organize her household chores, shop, or simply rest. Day care for children should not be viewed as a substitute for the mother, but as an enriching force in the lives of children and their families.

Use of Time of Nonworking Wives

Since the present study examines the use of the time gained by the nonworking day care mother, a review of a study on the use of time by unemployed wives follows. Morgan, Sirageldin, and Baerwaldt (1966, pp. 101-162) reported that nonworking mothers with young children tended to do more housework as their husbands worked more hours for money. The motive for these nonworking wives was to increase the real welfare of their family. Another form of unpaid productive work included volunteer work in religious or other charitable organizations. It was found that couples who had higher levels of education, had some home appliances, and had not moved too often did the most volunteer work. Time spent on getting more education was another form of unpaid productive work. This study documented the fact that "the educated get more education while the uneducated stay uneducated." Total hours of unpaid work were increased by close family ties, achievement, orientation, or living in a county where more people had completed high school. Age, sex, and family size, along with sickness and unemployment, influenced how many hours the family devoted to work for money, regular housework, and home production. Leisure

time of housewives varied from a half-hour to 5 hours a day, and urban wives had more leisure than rural wives. The need for income still appeared to be the main determinant of productive effort.

METHODS

Development of the Instrument

The method selected for gathering data was a personal interview questionnaire with a format of primarily structured questions.

Two questionnaires suitable for families of limited educational attainment were constructed. One was designed to be given to parents of children using day care centers, while the second was designed to be used with parents of children who were on the waiting list of a day care center. The two schedules included questions in all four of the following areas: (a) the impact of day care on family economics, (b) the influence of day care centers on the community, (c) the impact of day care on parent-child relationships, (d) the impact of roles of parents on children and the influence of day care participation on the husband-wife relationship. The interview schedule for the waiting list families also contained questions pertaining to their present child care services. Both questionnaires were divided into two sections, one for the mother and another for the father. The two sections of a questionnaire were quite similar, but it was felt that each family member should have the questionnaire administered separately.

The preliminary work with the interview involved several stages. A pilot study of the instrument was made with families of two day care centers in Centre County, Pennsylvania. The questionnaires were then revised before the training of the interviewers. Interviewers were

selected on the basis of their experience and their understanding of the types of people they would be interviewing. Selected interviewers attended a training program that consisted of two days of intensive training. Each conducted a preliminary test interview in the field.

Selection of the Sample

A questionnaire was sent to all Pennsylvania day care centers to obtain demographic data from which to select the samples for the study. A final group of 190 families were chosen from 39 day care centers.

An attempt was made to attain a representation of day care families from two different types of centers and from two geographical areas (Table 1). The type of support a center received determined the type of center. Title IV-A centers were those which received more than 50% of their budget from federal or state sources, and private centers were those which obtained their funds from the tuition paid by the parents. The two geographical areas were urban and rural. The urban sample came from the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh and their suburbs, while the rural families were selected from what was designated as rural, or sparsely populated, counties of Pennsylvania.

TABLE 1
SAMPLING GROUPS

	Rural		Urban	
	N	%	N	%
Waiting list	35	18.4	23	12.1
Title IV-A day care	30	15.7	31	16.3
Private day care	37	19.4	34	17.8

Since waiting list families supposedly had no prior influencing contact with a specific type of day care center, their selection was not as precise as that of the day care families in this respect. They were, however, chosen from the waiting lists of the same day care centers from which the day care sample came, and the urban-rural division was maintained (Table 1).

A family was not considered for inclusion in the sample unless it was intact. There had to be a father, a mother, and at least one preschool-aged child living in the home. Also the father and mother had to be legally married.

Procedure for Interviewing

After the families were selected, a letter was sent to each family explaining the purpose of the study and asking for their cooperation. A phone call followed, asking for an appointment by the interviewer, and a time was set. All interviews were conducted in the homes of the families at their convenience. The interview took approximately 1.5 hours. In addition to the interviewing, observational notes were made by the interviewer.

Characteristics of the Sample

Although all of the families were intact when selected, six were not by the time of the interview. These six families were included in the analyses.

The range of age for parents with children of day care age was great. Mothers were from 19 to 50 years old, and fathers were from 21 to 72 years of age. Their mean ages were 30.2 and 33.8 years, respectively.

Of the children in or awaiting day care 162 were between the ages of 3 and 12 years, and 83% of all the children in or awaiting day care were between the ages of 3 and 5 years.

The mean number of children per family under 18 years of age was 2.8, while the national average for children per family is 2.3.

No significant differences ($p < .05$) in number of years married were found between the day care and waiting list groups, between the urban and rural day care groups, or between the Title IV-A and private day care groups. The mean number of years of marriage was 8.8 years for all families.

The means for the employment status of the 190 families are presented in Table 2. The rate of employment for day care mothers was 57.6%, while that of the waiting list mothers was 22.4%. The rate of employment for both parents was also higher for day care parents than for the waiting list group.

Not all of the 190 families interviewed gave complete data concerning the economic information asked of them. Therefore, the different analyses vary in the total number of persons included. Each analysis contains the number of persons who gave full information on that particular subject.

TABLE 2
EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	N	%
Husband and wife unemployed	19	10.0
Husband employed, wife unemployed	82	43.1
Husband unemployed, wife employed	5	2.63
Husband employed, wife employed	84	44.2

A total of 36 families of the 163 who gave complete financial information were receiving monetary assistance from the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare. Of the waiting list group, 35% were receiving welfare funds, and 16% of the day care families were receiving welfare funds.

The mean years of education for day care mothers was 12.14, while the mean years of education was 11.34 for the waiting list mothers.

RESULTS

Economic Status of Day Care and Waiting List Families

Total Monthly Income. A chi square test was used for the comparison of frequencies and percentages of the total monthly income for the different groups (Table 3). The total monthly incomes of the families in the entire sample ranged from \$224 to \$1,665. There was a relationship for total monthly income between the day care and waiting list groups that was significant at the .03 level. Almost 22% of the day care families were in the highest income range as compared to 5.7% of the waiting list families. Three times as many rural families appeared in the lowest income range as urban families, and there were twice as many urban families in the highest income range as rural families. There was a significant relationship at the .006 level between the private day care families and the Title IV-A families. Three times as many Title IV-A families were in the low income bracket as private day care families, and three times as many private day care families appeared in the highest income range as Title IV-A day care families.

TABLE 3
TOTAL MONTHLY INCOME

Total Monthly Income	Waiting List		Total		Rural		Day Care Urban		Private		Title IV-A	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
\$200-399	10	18.9	13	11.8	10	16.9	3	5.9	3	5.6	10	17.9
400-599	22	41.5	33	30.0	18	30.5	15	29.4	12	22.2	21	37.5
600-999	18	34.0	40	36.4	22	37.3	18	35.3	21	38.9	19	33.9
1,000 -	3	5.7	24	21.8	9	15.3	15	29.4	18	33.3	6	10.7
Total	53	32.5	110	67.5	59	53.6	51	46.4	54	49.1	56	50.9

$\chi^2 = 8.35915$
P = .0391
n = 163

$\chi^2 = 5.38864$
P = .1455
n = 110

$\chi^2 = 12.29148$
P = .0065
n = 110

A further breakdown of the day care families is reported in Table 4. There was a significant relationship at the .02 level between the four divisions of day care and total monthly income. Private urban day care families represented 41.7% of the \$1,000 and up income range, while rural Title IV-A families represented only 3.4% of the same high income range. Twice as many of the urban families appeared in the highest income range as rural families. There was a significant relationship at the .006 level between the private day care families and the Title IV-A families. Three times as many Title IV-A families were in the low income bracket as private day care families, and three times as many private day care families were in the highest income range as Title IV-A day care families.

TABLE 4
TOTAL MONTHLY INCOME OF THE DAY CARE GROUP BY THE
TYPE AND LOCATION OF THE DAY CARE CENTERS

Total Monthly Income	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
\$200-399	3	10.0	7	24.1	0	0.0	3	11.1
400-599	6	20.0	12	41.4	6	25.0	9	33.3
600-999	13	43.3	9	31.0	8	33.3	10	37.0
1000-up	8	26.7	1	3.4	10	41.7	5	18.5
Total	30	27.3	29	26.4	24	21.8	27	24.5

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2 &= 19.17583 \\ P &= .0237 \\ n &= 110 \end{aligned}$$

Table 5 presents the median incomes of the different groups of day care and waiting list families. Among all groups, the waiting list families had the lowest median for total monthly income. The Title IV-A group showed the lowest median for total monthly income among the day care groups, while the private day care families had the highest.

TABLE 5
MEDIAN FOR THE TOTAL MONTHLY INCOMES

Families	N	Median
All families	163	\$ 599
Waiting list	53	497
Day care	110	643
Rural	59	599
Urban	51	698
Private	54	742
Title IV-A	56	520

Per Capita Monthly Income. In the chi square test, used to determine the relationship between the various groups for per capita monthly income (Table 6), a significant relationship at the .0001 level appeared between the per capita monthly income of the day care families and the waiting list families. The waiting list families were double that of the day care families in the \$40-79 and \$80-119 income ranges. The largest difference appeared in the \$200 per month income range, where the percentage of day care families was seven times that of waiting list families.

When the day care groups were compared, there was no significant relationship ($p < .05$) between the urban and rural groups, but a significant relationship ($p < .05$) appeared between the private and Title IV-A groups. There were 2.5 times as many Title IV-A families in the three lowest income ranges as private day care families and twice as many private day care families as Title IV-A families in the two highest monthly income ranges.

TABLE 6
PER CAPITA INCOME

Per Capita Income (Month)	Waiting List		Day Care									
			Total		Rural		Urban		Private		Title	IV-A
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
\$ 1-39	0	0	1	0.9	1	1.7	0	0	0	0	1	1.8
40-79	14	27.5	17	15.6	12	20.3	5	10.0	2	3.8	15	26.8
80-119	23	45.1	21	19.3	15	25.4	6	12.0	8	15.1	13	23.2
120-199	11	21.6	30	27.5	11	18.6	19	38.0	13	24.5	17	30.4
200-up	3	5.9	40	36.7	20	33.9	20	40.0	30	56.6	10	17.9
Total	51	31.9	109	68.1	59	54.1	50	45.9	53	48.6	56	51.4

$X^2 = 24.17506$
P = .0001
n = 160

$X^2 = 9.19237$
P = .0565
n = 109

$X^2 = 22.5995$
P = .0002
n = 109

When the day care groups were compared, there was no significant relationship ($p < .05$) between the urban and rural groups, but a significant relationship ($p < .05$) appeared between the private and Title IV-A groups. There were 2.5 times as many Title IV-A families in the three lowest income ranges as private day care families and twice as many private day care families as Title IV-A families in the two highest monthly income ranges.

Percentage of Total Monthly Income Derived From Wages. In the American society people who are paid wages are considered socially productive individuals, and income derived from wages has a tendency to be more socially and psychologically acceptable than welfare income. Therefore, the wage component of the monthly income was regarded as an important

variable to include. In considering the wage component of income, the percentage of wages in a family's total monthly income was determined

$$[\text{Wage component} = 100 \frac{\text{Wages}}{(\text{Total income})}] .$$

The wage component of the income of waiting list and day care families is shown in Table 7. Approximately 89% of the day care families derived 71-100% of their income from wages. Eight Title IV-A day care families received only 1-10% of their income from wages. More waiting list families than day care families received 1-10% of their income from wages.

TABLE 7
WAGE COMPONENT OF INCOME

Percent of Income in Wages	Waiting List		Day Care									
			Total		Rural		Urban		Private		Title IV-A	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Low 0 - 30	10	18.9	8	7.3	5	8.5	3	5.9	0	0	8	14.3
Medium 31 - 70	7	13.2	4	3.6	2	3.4	2	3.9	2	3.7	2	3.6
High 71 - 100	36	67.9	98	89.1	52	88.1	46	90.2	52	96.3	46	82.1

Wages of Employed Mothers. A chi square test was used to compare the frequencies and percentages of the different groups of employed mothers (Table 8). There was no significant relationship ($p < .05$) between the various groups of mothers. The mothers in the private urban day care group received the highest wages.

The mean income of mothers in the different groups was also calculated. The results appear in Table 9. A T-test was also made to determine the differences between the means of the wages of mothers in the various groups, but no significant differences ($p < .05$) were found.

TABLE 8
WAGES OF EMPLOYED MOTHERS

Wages of Mothers (Monthly)	Waiting List		Day Care									
			Total		Rural		Urban		Private		Title IV-A	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
\$ 1-199	3	25.0	8	11.0	4	11.4	4	10.5	4	8.9	4	14.3
200-399	5	41.7	31	42.5	15	42.9	16	42.1	18	40.0	13	46.4
400-599	2	16.7	26	35.6	15	42.9	11	28.9	17	37.8	9	32.1
600-999	2	16.7	8	11.0	1	2.9	7	18.4	6	13.3	2	7.1
Total	12	14.1	73	85.9	35	47.9	38	52.1	45	61.6	28	38.4

$\chi^2 = 2.98044$
P = .3947
n = 85

$\chi^2 = 5.03285$
P = .1694
n = 73

$\chi^2 = 1.38415$
P = .7093
n = 73

TABLE 9
MEAN MONTHLY INCOME OF THE MOTHERS

	N	Means
Entire sample	85	359.235
Waiting list	12	343.1665
Day care	73	361.8767
Rural	31	342.0000
Urban	34	367.8823
Private	37	368.7837
Title IV-A	28	338.0356

Net Income. Net income consists of a family's total income minus the costs of child care and transportation.

The mean of the day care group and the waiting list group was determined for net income (Table 10), and a T-test was run to establish the difference between the two means. The T-test showed that the net income of day care families was greater than the net income of waiting list families at a significant level ($p .05$).

TABLE 10
MEANS OF NET INCOME

	N	Mean
Day care	110	666
Waiting list	53	556

Employment Status of Mothers

A chi square test was performed to compare the frequencies and percentages of the different groups of mothers for employment status. The results appear in Table 11.

A significant relationship ($p .05$) was found between the employment status of day care mothers and waiting list mothers, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. There were 58.3% of the day care mothers working, while only 22.4% of the waiting list mothers were employed. Another important finding was that seven of the day care mothers were able to take job training, but none of the waiting list mothers were in training. Perhaps the use of day care facilities made job training possible for at least a few mothers.

TABLE 11
EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Employment Status of Mothers	Waiting List		Day Care									
			Total		Rural		Urban		Private		Title IV-A	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Not working	45	77.6	48	36.4	26	38.8	22	33.8	17	23.9	31	50.8
Working	13	22.4	77	58.3	36	53.7	41	63.1	51	71.8	26	42.6
In training	0	0.0	7	5.3	5	7.5	2	3.1	3	4.2	4	6.6
Total	58	30.5	132	69.5	67	50.8	65	49.2	71	53.8	61	46.2

$\chi^2 = 28.04024$
P = .0000
n = 190

$\chi^2 = 1.91386$
P = .3841
n = 132

$\chi^2 = 11.65238$
P = .0029
n = 132

When the day care groups were compared, the difference between rural and urban families was not significant ($p < .05$), but the difference between the private day care mothers and Title IV-A mothers was significant at the level of .0029. Three of the mothers in job training were using private day care centers, and four were from Title IV-A centers. Five mothers in job training were rural and two were urban.

The two main divisions of the day care groups were divided more specifically and the frequencies and percentages were compared (Table 12). A significant relationship ($p < .05$) was found between the four types of day care families and the employment status of mothers. The largest number of working mothers used private rural day care centers, and the next largest group sent their children to private urban day care centers. The

greatest number of nonworking mothers using day care appeared in the Title IV-A rural category. The only type of day care not used by mothers in job training was the private urban day care center.

TABLE 12
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE DAY CARE MOTHERS BY THE
TYPE AND LOCATION OF THE DAY CARE CENTERS

	Private Rural		Title IV-A Rural		Private Urban		Title IV-A Urban		Total Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not working	7	14.6	19	39.6	10	20.8	12	25.0	48	36.4
Working	27	35.1	9	11.7	24	31.2	17	22.1	77	58.3
In training	3	42.9	2	28.6	0	0.0	2	28.6	7	5.3
Total	37	28.0	30	22.7	34	25.8	31	23.5	132	100.0

$$X^2 = 18.55852$$

$$P = .0050$$

Homemakers who were using day care facilities but were unemployed were asked what they did with their released time from child care. A frequency and percentage table (Table 13) reports the distribution of the answers. Approximately 52% of the day care users not employed spent their released time from child care in household production or with their other children still at home. Nearly 26% spent their released time in more leisure or rest.

TABLE 13
USE OF TIME OF NONWORKING DAY CARE MOTHERS

Use of Time	Total		Rural		Urban		Private		Title IV-A	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Household produc- tion, care of other child	14	51.9	11	61.1	3	33.3	4	50.0	10	52.6
2. Community involvement	3	11.1	0	0.0	3	33.3	1	12.5	2	10.5
3. More leisure or rest	7	25.9	5	27.8	2	22.2	2	25.0	5	26.3
4. Other*	3	11.1	2	11.1	1	11.1	1	12.5	2	10.5

*Such activities as socializing with other mothers, shopping, watching T.V.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate a relationship between the use of day care and the economic status of families, as measured by total and per capita incomes. The median total monthly income for the 163 families which responded fully to the income question was \$599, while the median monthly income for day care families was \$643, and that of the waiting list families was \$497 per month. Furthermore, the waiting list group was found to have a higher proportion of families receiving funds from the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare than the day care group.

There was also a positive relationship between the employment of mothers, the use of day care, and higher total and per capita family incomes. Only 22.4% of the waiting list mothers were employed, and none were in training. The day care group showed 58.3% of the mothers working and seven, or 5.3%,

in training. Apparently, when the problem of adequate child care has been taken care of, women do take advantage of job opportunities that are available and move into the labor forces to increase their family's median income. These findings support those of Ginzberg (1967), who reported that many mothers would like to work but are unable to find facilities for day care.

A significant difference in the total and per capita income of the families using different centers was found. The private day care families had a considerably higher median monthly income (\$742/month) than the Title IV-A day care families (\$520/month), and incomes of private urban day care families were significantly higher in both total and per capita incomes than the other types of day care families. A high percentage of Title IV-A rural families were using welfare funds and were unemployed, which may presumably be due to a lack of job opportunities and transportation facilities in rural areas.

Fried (1971) pointed out that people from rural backgrounds possess lower levels of education and are employed in lower levels of occupations. At every occupational level, people from rural origins are disadvantaged in their total earnings. Apparently the Title IV-A rural families in this study were less able to find job opportunities or the adequate transportation facilities necessary to approach the employment levels of other day care families.

According to a review of literature (Fried, 1971; Ginzberg, 1967; Mead, 1971; Steiner, 1971, pp. 51-74; Stevenson, 1969; & Yanarella, 1971, pp. 1-53) many nonworking poor women are either unable to find work, lack sufficient

work skills, or have been encouraged to stay home and take care of their children. Job opportunities for women have also been limited by such problems as inadequate child care and transportation and health problems. Transportation arrangements for children to and from the center and for mothers from the center to work, for example, require planning, cooperation, and support from others (Stevenson, 1969). Conditions such as these may partially answer the question of why more rural and low income women were not working or in training.

Fried (1971) and Mead (1971) reported the major inducement to work among women of low or working class status positions to be the compelling necessity to earn additional money. But, according to Holmes (1961), a wife's net income, after taking out her direct job related and extra expenses, amounts to about half of her gross earnings when preschool children are involved. Expenses of this sort do not affect the family income, but do affect the mother's willingness to go to work. The lower costs of day care facilities make it possible for many mothers to be able to work and to bring home most of their pay check.

Approximately 52% of the unemployed mothers using day care spent the time their child was away in more household production and with other children still at home; 25.9% spent their time released from child care in more leisure or rest. The sharing of child care responsibilities seems to permit a "breather" for mothers who are not working and provides them with time to refresh themselves or become involved in their own interests.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This report has brought to light several possibilities for future study. Further research is needed on how the educational level and job classification of employed mothers and employment possibilities relate to the employment status of day care versus non day care mothers.

Furthermore, a comparison of families with child care should provide a more precise comparison of the impact of day care children on the economic status of families with no child care arrangements.

Employment motivation and satisfaction in relation to the job classification of employed mothers should also be further investigated. The relationship among such variables as level of education, income, child care mode, residence, and funding, could provide further information on the employed mother and her job motivation.

In addition researchers should consider other groups, such as 1-parent families, families of various ethnic groups, families using other forms of child care, and finally, and very important, low income and welfare families.

SUMMARY

Families using day care were compared with families on day care waiting lists to determine if the use of day care is related to their economic status.

A significant relationship was found between the use of day care and the economic status of families as measured by total and per capita monthly income. The day care group was also found to have a notably higher median monthly income than the waiting list group. The waiting list group was found to have a higher proportion of families receiving funds from the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare than the day care group.

Findings revealed that there was a positive relationship between the use of day care and the employment of mothers. Another important finding was that all seven mothers in job training were using day care.

Nearly 52% of the unemployed day care mothers spent their time released from child care in more household production and were able to spend more time with other preschool children still at home. The sharing of child care responsibilities also allowed mothers time to refresh themselves and become involved in their own interests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnold, M. Day care - An expanding resource for child welfare. Paper presented at a meeting sponsored by Child Welfare League of America, Family Service Association of America and National Committee for the Day Care of Children & National Conference on Social Welfare, Los Angeles, May 1964.
- Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. American occupational structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- Eppley, D. Characteristics of a state public assistance plans. Welfare in Review, 1968, 6 (5).
- Fried, M. A Study of demographic and social determinants of functional achievement in a Negro population. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1971, in press.
- Fried, M. The world of the working class. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1971, in press.
- Ginzberg, E. Advice to the urban coalition. The Reporter, 1967, 37 (3), 18-20.
- Ginzberg, E. Manpower agenda for America. New York: McGraw Hill, 1968.
- Holmes, E. G. Job-related expenditures and management practices of gainfully employed wives in Ohio. (Home Economics Research No. 27) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service, 1962.
- Manning, S. L. Time use in household tasks by Indiana families. (Research Bulletin No. 837) Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University, Agriculture Experiment Station, 1968.
- Mead, M. Working mothers and their children. The Social Service Outlook, 1971, 6 (3), 8-11.
- Morgan, J. N., Sirageldin, I. A., & Baerwaldt, N. Productive Americans. Survey Research Center Monograph (University of Michigan), 1966, No. 43.
- Myers, L., Elliott, V., Harrell, J., & Hostetter, M. J. The Family and Community Day Care Interview. (Technical Report No. 6) University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, 1972.
- Nye, F. I., & Hoffman, L. W. The employed mother in America, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

- Steiner, G. Y. The state of welfare. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute, 1971.
- Stevenson, G. Day care - Small fry pose big problem. Manpower, 1969, 1 (7), 14-17.
- Upton, M. E. The impact of day care in a poverty area. Child Welfare, 1969, 48 (4), 231-234.
- Wade, C. The family day care program in Milwaukee: A three-faceted approach to community enrichment. Child Welfare, 1970, 49 (6), 336-341.
- Waldman, E., & Gover, K. R. Children of women in the labor force. Monthly Labor Review, 1971, 94 (7), 19-25.
- Warner, W. L. Social class in America: A manual of procedure for the measurement of social status. Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- Williamson, J. Welfare policy and population policy: A conflict in goals. Urban and Social Change Review, 1970, 4 (1), 21-23.
- Yanarella, A. M. U. W. Public assistance system: History, evaluation, alternatives, and prospects for reform. (Working Paper No. 1) Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky, Social Research Institute, 1971.

SUMMARY

The following summary presents the most significant findings offered in the preceeding reports so as to provide an overall picture of the group that was studied.

The day care parents did participate at their centers, women more than men, but both groups desired more participation in the form of working directly with the children at the centers. They did not desire more of the type of participation that would mean taking home materials for their children or attending parent education courses, and, on the whole, they did not complain that there was a lack of parent participation. A fair proportion of parents, however, did not feel qualified to work at the center or needed, neither did they feel that there was an opportunity to participate.

Day care parents were not found to participate significantly more in their communities after their children entered day care nor did they participate more than the group of waiting list parents. However, Title IV-A mothers did show a trend towards increased participation. Both day care and waiting list parents appeared to have little information as to what power different groups or institutions in their community had concerning day care. They also did not know what the opinions of these groups or institutions were toward day care.

The day care families were better off economically than the waiting list families. Their incomes were higher, more mothers were employed, and less families were receiving welfare support. Those day care mothers who were not employed were spending more time on household production or more time with other children.

Day care families, particularly mothers, were found to have a higher level of marital satisfaction than those of the waiting list group.

Further analysis of present data will be necessary to provide a fully integrated picture of our day care families. The following topics are of particular interest:

- a. The relationship between community participation and parent participation.
- b. The relationship between parent participation, community participation, and the utilization of community services.
- c. The relationship between maternal employment and the participation of mothers.
- d. The relationship between family size and parent and community participation.
- e. The relationship between educational achievement and job level.

REFERENCES FOR THE INTRODUCTION

Myers, L., Elliott, V., Harrell, J., & Hostetter, M. J. The Family and Community Day Care Interview, (Technical Report No. 6) University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, The Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project, 1972.

Pennsylvania Day Care Study Project. The Pennsylvania Day Care Study. (Technical Report No. 3) University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University, Center for Human Services Development, 1972.